

THE CATHOLIC MIND

VOL. XLI

MAY, 1943

NO. 965

American War Aims

AMBASSADOR CARLTON J. H. HAYES

Address delivered before a group which included representatives of allied and friendly missions and officials of the Spanish Government at the Casa Americana, Annex of the U. S. Embassy, Madrid, January 15, 1943.

IT is a curious fact that just as the United States began its national history as a federation of thirteen colonies, so now thirteen sovereign States of the American Continents are leagued together in a world-war of colossal magnitude. These thirteen comprise one English-speaking country—the United States of America; one half-English and half-French—the Dominion of Canada; one great Portuguese-speaking country—Brazil; one French-speaking country—Haiti; and nine Spanish-speaking countries—Mexico, Cuba, the Dominican Republic, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua, El Salvador, Costa Rica and Panama. All thirteen American nations are leagued together, moreover, in support of common objectives, and with those objectives certainly sympathize practically all the governments and peoples of the New World.

Why, then, to be specific, is the United States at war? Why are North American soldiers and sailors and air-men fighting alongside other Americans and also alongside British and Australians and French and Dutch and Belgians and Norwegians and Greeks and Poles and Czechoslovaks and Yugoslavs and Chinese and Russians? Why is the United States devoting all its man-power and material resources to the war and extending its battle fronts far away from America to North Africa, to New Guinea and the Solomon Islands, to Burma and China, to Iraq and Iran, to the coasts of France and the Low Countries, to the industrial nerve-centers of Germany and Italy? And why is the United States determined not to accept a negotiated peace of compromise but to fight this war through, no matter what sacrifices

it may entail, to a complete and overwhelming victory? In a word, what are the American war-aims?

No nation is likely to plunge into a war of the extent and magnitude of the present global struggle without some powerful motivation. One does not risk everything for little stakes. Believe me, the Government and people of the United States are no exception to that rule.

CORRECTS MISAPPREHENSION

Let me, at the outset, correct some misapprehensions which our enemies have sedulously propagated and let me state clearly what American war-aims are not. First, we do not aim at any extension of our national territory or seek any protectorate or other imperialistic sway over other peoples. Whatever imperialistic impulse certain segments of my people may have exhibited or yielded to in the 19th century has quite disappeared in the 20th century. To this, not only our words but our deeds bear witness. In 1918 when we had ample opportunity and even invitation, we established no protectorate, assumed no mandate, appropriated not a square inch of land anywhere. Long before the present war began, we promised independence to the Filipinos, and by the time Japan attacked us the sovereign Commonwealth of the Philippines was well on the road to full realization. With all our sister republics of the American continents we have developed, and we practise, the policy of the "good neighbor," and this policy we

seek to apply to the Old, as well as the New, World. We have solemnly and specifically engaged to respect the territorial integrity of this Iberian peninsula together with the overseas possessions of both Spain and Portugal. And we have likewise engaged not to tarry longer in French North Africa or elsewhere on alien soil than military exigencies absolutely require. Imperialism is most emphatically not an American war-aim. We fight not for conquest.

Second, we do not aim at imposing a particular form of government or a particular set of social institutions upon any other nation. As I said when I presented my credentials to His Excellency the Chief of the Spanish State last June: "We do not try to impose our system of government on any other people; equally, we are always quick to resist any attempt of another government to impose its system on us."

I know, alas, with what constancy and assiduity the factories of Axis propaganda manufacture stories to the contrary. I know, for example here in Spain, that they produce the most terrifying pictures of the consequences of Allied victory—intervention in behalf of some minority, resumption of civil war, reign of chaos and terrorism, triumph of Marxian Communism. This, ladies and gentlemen, is the main stock-in-trade of Dr. Goebbels and his associates, which should find market only among the timid and the gullible.

The United States is not Communist. Great Britain is not Communist. Brazil is not Communist. Among the

great majority of the United Nations, the number of Communists and of sympathizers with Communism is very slight. Even the one country which is professedly Communist must be actuated in the magnificent and, I might add, successful defense it is now making less by Marxian doctrines than by the spirit of national freedom. What the United Nations will most want at the end of the present war is a continuity of traditional law and order, and any government which can maintain or establish such law and order will have the material as well as spiritual support of the United Nations. For in the last analysis the best guarantee against Communism, for any nation which does not voluntarily choose it, is a government able to maintain order and to provide for the material needs of its people. Among the United Nations are the world's granaries and depots for supplying just those needs at the end of the present war.

The United States recognizes that no two nations have exactly the same historic traditions and that consequently no one form of government is equally suitable for all. Even the so-called democracies differ greatly in their democratic conceptions and usages. English democracy is different from American democracy, and both are different from Brazilian—or Polish—democracy. As the United States would not wish to impose its particular brand on Brazil, so much the more will it refrain from seeking to impose it upon an ancient country like Spain. If the political and

social institutions of this country undergo change or modification in future years, it will be the work of Spaniards within Spain, not of the United States or of Spanish emigrés. No, American war-aims are neither political nor socialistic.

AXIS PROPAGANDA

Let me here refer, in passing, to yet another alleged war-aim which is not American. I have occasionally heard it said—doubtless an echo of Axis propaganda—that the present war is simply a trade-war, a capitalist war, a war for money-stakes, by means of which the United States is trying to get a strangle-hold on the world's riches. This seems to be a patently silly allegation. It staggers my imagination to conceive how, if my nation is fighting this war for capitalistic stakes, it can be accused simultaneously of favoring Communism. But that merely staggers imagination. What puts it to utter rout is one's inability to perceive how any financial gains from the present war can be at all commensurate with the fantastic expenditure involved. Already the United States alone—exclusive of its allies—is spending \$250,000,000 a day, or, at the legal rate of exchange, 2,737,000,000 pesetas a day, which in a year's time amounts to \$91,250,000,000 or almost a thousand billion pesetas. These, ladies and gentlemen, are astronomical figures. They have no relationship to any possible money-return from an impoverished post-war world.

Actually in economics, as in politics, the United States is committed to the principle of asking nothing for itself which it is not willing to concede to others. It aims at no economic exclusiveness, at no monopolizing of natural resources or of the products of labor. It will undoubtedly be a creditor nation at the close of the war, but as such its own self-interest must dictate a policy of promoting the solvency and prosperity of the world at large. This can only be done, my Government has said, by freeing international trade to the greatest possible extent and by making raw materials available to all peoples on an equal basis.

AMERICANS IDEALISTIC

I have dwelt too long, perhaps, on what American war-aims are not. To grasp what they really are, one must disabuse one's mind of the common but absurd fallacy that because my countrymen make a good deal of machinery—and pretty good machinery—they must be materialistic. Rather, one has to recognize the opposite truth that the people of the United States are intensely idealistic—incurably idealistic. Americans have in them more of the Spanish than you might guess; they are, in their peculiar way, the Don Quixotes of the 20th century.

For one thing, Americans love liberty—liberty for the individual, liberty for nations. This is not to say that they are necessarily sympathetic with everything which has gone by the name of liberalism, especially with that sectarian

liberalism which in parts of Europe during the last century hardly disguised a selfish and pagan materialism. The liberty which Americans revere is the liberty of the 17th and 18th centuries, based on medieval Christian tradition and reenforced by New World life and experience. It is the liberty of St. Thomas Aquinas, of Suarez and Locke, and also of Washington and Jefferson, of Bolívar and Lincoln.

Then, too, despite what would seem to be very fundamental differences among them, Americans have learned to live together in peace and security, without liberty degenerating into license, and with growing mutual respect. The United States has attained to it, quite literally in accordance with its Latin motto, *E pluribus unum*. It is a unity in which share a Protestant majority, Catholics more numerous than those in Spain, Jews more numerous than in any other country. It is a unity of Yankee New England, of originally Dutch and now cosmopolitan New York, of French Louisiana, of Scandinavian Minnesota, of historically Spanish California, Arizona, New Mexico, Texas and Florida, of peoples of the most diverse European extraction—Italian and German, Polish and Irish, English and Slav. The United States is a veritable association of nations, a very practical one; and Americans, recognizing that it has been achieved through cultivation of a good-neighbor policy at home, naturally glory in this policy and regard it as a proper article for export abroad.

Besides, Americans are peace-loving. They do not hanker after war and only grave and direct provocation will get them into war. They wanted very much to stay out of the present war, and they did stay out of it until they were treacherously attacked. They are, indeed, so used to adjusting differences among themselves by conference and debate and by a sporting rule of give-and-take that they have difficulty in understanding why the nations of the world should not settle their differences in like manner.

Yet once aroused, Americans can and will fight. And what most arouses them is resentment at being pushed around, or, almost equally, at seeing other people pushed around.

VIOLENCE AND TERROR

It is because the Axis Powers of Germany, Italy and Japan have latterly been doing a good deal of pushing that the United States, in league with other United Nations, is at war with the Axis. Our central war-aim is to put a stop to the pushing.

The spectacle which the Nazi regime presents inside Germany is sufficiently disgusting and revolting, with its maltreatment of Jews, its persecution of the Catholic Church, its utilization of violence and terror to establish what Pope Pius XI characterized as "the grossest paganism." Yet while we have regretted and reprobated what the Nazis have done within their own country, we have long been patient and have felt that the responsibil-

ity and the remedy alike lay, not with us or any foreigners, but with the German people. According to our principles, it was for Germans to decide what domestic regime they would live under, provided only that they respected the right of other peoples to a like freedom.

But this is precisely what Germany and the other Axis Powers have not respected. For several years now, as everybody knows, they have employed force and violence not only to enslave their own peoples but also to conquer and despoil other peoples, to deprive them of their freedom and to impose upon them alien rule and the worst forms of vassalage and slavery. Nazi Germany has definitely run amok in Czechoslovakia, Poland, the Baltic countries and the Ukraine, in Norway, Denmark, Holland, Belgium and France, and, with ghoulish seconding from Fascist Italy, in Greece and Yugoslavia. Japan has similarly brought havoc and death to China, to the Spanish-speaking Catholic Philippines, to the Dutch East Indies, to Siam and Burma. In vain Great Britain and other powers tried to be reasonable and conciliatory; they found to their grief, one after another, that the only recourse left them was to oppose force with force. In vain, the United States and the other American Republics protested their desire for peace; as they began preparations for defense, Japan descended with deadly bombs on Pearl Harbor, and Germany and Italy quickly joined in the attack on America.

Americans have long suspected—and now they know—that the so-called “New Order” which the Axis advertises as its supreme war-aim is simply a gigantic pushing around and pushing down of practically all the peoples of the world in the selfish interest of a pair of swashbuckling and would-be “superior” Powers—Nazi Germany and Imperial Japan. Even the original third partner is by now merely a silent partner; a kind of burned-out satellite helplessly held to its appointed course by solar Berlin.

The objectives of the German-Japanese “New Order” are clearly revealed in the war-aims which I have previously said were not American and which indeed are absolutely antithetical to those of the United Nations. It is Nazi Germany and Militaristic Japan which would blot out the independence of nations, annex territory far and wide, and establish imperialistic hegemonies, the one over Europe and Africa, the other over Asia and Oceania. It is the same Germany and Japan which would tear other peoples loose from their historic roots and compel them slavishly to imitate the political and social institutions and the de-Christianizing processes of the self-styled “Master” peoples. It is, likewise, the same Germany and Japan which would exploit the world’s economy to their own exclusive advantage, thereby impoverishing less favored nations and in the long run preparing them for Communist or other desperate adventures.

Against the menace of this German-Japanese world order, Americans wish ardently to retain their freedom—their freedom to determine their own form of government, to live their own lives, to work and trade with some assurance of security and in an atmosphere of peace. In this sense American war-aims are strictly defensive; they signify defense of the American continents against an alien and aggressive world order. But in a broader sense American war-aims surely represent the aspirations and yearnings of all nations and peoples who want to be free and decent and self-respecting. They have been published to the world, let me remind you, in that solemn joint declaration of the President of the United States and the Prime Minister of Great Britain—the Atlantic Charter.

This Charter not only defines the war-aims of the countries named, but to all others it conveys assurances of a future peace of justice and right. “Their countries,” affirm the signatories of the Charter, “seek no aggrandizement, territorial or other. They desire to see no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned. They respect the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live; and they wish to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them. They will endeavor . . . to further enjoyment by all States, great or small,

... of access, on equal terms, to the trade and to the raw materials of the world which are needed for their economic prosperity. They desire to bring about the fullest collaboration between all nations in the economic field, with the object of securing for all improved labor standards, economic advancement and social security. After the final destruction of Nazi tyranny, they hope to see established a peace which will afford to all nations the means of dwelling in safety within their own boundaries, and which will afford assurance that all the men in all the lands may live out their lives in freedom from fear and want . . ."

These objectives accord perfectly with the best and highest traditions of Christian civilization as expressed so clearly and authoritatively in recent Christmas allocutions of the Sovereign

Pontiff. They accord likewise with the natural rights of man and with the promptings of his conscience. Between these objectives and those of the Axis leaders, there can be no compromise.

There can be, then, no "negotiated" peace. The war must be fought to a finish, for it is a war between freedom and enslavement, between civilization and barbarism.

I said at the beginning that "no nation is likely to plunge into a war of the extent and magnitude of the present global struggle without some powerful motivation," and that "one does not risk everything for little stakes." I conclude by stressing the greatness of the stakes now involved and by pledging you that Americans are firmly and unitedly determined to do their part to win the war and to establish and maintain a just peace.



America and Peace

Thank God that our beloved country has paralleled the efforts of Benedict XV, Pius XI and Pius XII to preserve peace among the nations. Amid our own shortcomings as a nation, amid our own too ready forgetfulness of God, our people and our leadership since the last war have striven for a deep and lasting peace in the world. A willingness to disarm, conversations, agreements, pacts, neutrality, embargo, appeals to leaders of nations, every means, short only of a sacrifice of national honor and our nation's security and preservation, has been employed. Our enemies—and these are the enemies of the world—must have regarded the efforts of our Presidents and of our State Department, viewed from their own standards of insincerity and duplicity, as naive in the extreme. History will record otherwise. History will confirm St. Augustine's dictum "the sister of justice is an inviolable faith."—*Most Rev. Peter L. Ireton, D.D., Coadjutor Bishop of Richmond.*

Twenty Million Australians Wanted

An editorial reprinted from THE ADVOCATE, Melbourne, January 21, 1943

IF THERE is one thing more certain than another about Australia's post-war future, it is that her people will have to take very seriously indeed the famous slogan of Mr. Hughes: "Populate or Perish!" There are certain facts about our situation whose implications both leaders and people are still reluctant to face, in spite of intermittent references to the "population problem" by those who are discussing national planning.

First, we have to realize that, however thoroughly Japan is defeated in this war—and there is no sign that we are anywhere near defeating her yet—she will remain a powerful nation, with clever and fertile people, equipped with a great industrial plant. The question of how and where her pressure of population is to find relief will not be solved merely by destroying the power of her military caste; though we may hope that victory will pave the way for a satisfactory settlement of the problem.

The second point to notice is that the war will probably produce revolutionary changes in the status of the Eastern world generally; the people of that world will not fall back into the passive acceptance of their former inferiority. Asia is broad awake; and the concession of full national equality to China by Great Britain and the United States is pregnant with significance for the whole future of the Pacific. It is

clear, then, that Australia will not be able to keep the East out of her empty lands by putting up a "no admittance" sign and counting on America to keep out trespassers. She will have to adopt a positive "population policy" and carry it out with determination and constancy; and, to begin with, it will be necessary for our rulers to cease deceiving themselves, and the people, with illusions on the subject of what lies before them.

POPULATION GROWTH

A recent book published here has declared that the "open spaces" are a myth; but its writer admits that Australian population growth is necessary, though he believes it should be a matter of social, and not of migration policy. No one has been more earnest than we in advocating social policies calculated to promote natality; but we admit a certain skepticism regarding their efficacy, failing a radical "change of heart" in the ordinary Australian. In any case, their effect will be slow in manifesting itself, and the danger is that destiny may not wait upon our convenience.

The argument, therefore, that a large-scale plan for immigration is an essential part of Australian reconstruction seems difficult to rebut. The figure of "twenty million" has been mentioned as an objective to be attained in the

next twenty years; which means that the continent is to be filled up to what is considered its capacity by most experts, in the course of less than a generation.

Whether the attainment of this figure is practicable, we will not venture to judge; but of one thing we are certain—that a scheme of settlement of this size will involve upsetting of our "way of life" more radical than that of the war itself, and changes exceedingly costly in terms of temporary comfort and convenience. It requires a united determination of all political parties, and of the whole nation, if the policy is to be carried through relentlessly under a democratic regime; and this means that the need of "austerity" and sacrifice must be impressed upon the people, not only as a war-time necessity, but as a permanent condition of survival in the world of tomorrow. The less talk there is of "dream cities" or a golden future for all now, the less danger there will be of folly and disillusion later on.

It must be realized, too, that immigration on this scale means a radical change in the character of the Australian nation itself. Obviously, we cannot bring our population to 20,000,000 by importing British, or North American, or "North European" stocks. Our politicians must abandon the notion that they can go about the world picking out "desirable types"—clean and literate, with orderly habits and correct principles; Protestants preferred.

These people will not crowd here

to take up a hard life on our land, or to seek employment in our new industries. They will prefer to remain at home, and there will be plenty for them to do in the reconstruction of their liberated countries. We have two alternative courses before us, if we wish to fill this country quickly.

TWO COURSES

The first is to admit the East peacefully, opening our doors to Chinese, Malays or Indians, while endeavoring to impose our culture and living standards upon them, and to avoid the racial distinctions which have cursed South Africa and America. If this policy were accepted, Australia might remain English in speech and customs, but her people would come to be mixed blood; like those of Brazil or Mexico.

The second—less repugnant to our ideas—is to do our utmost to attract large numbers of peasant people from Europe, and provide for their settlement as communities. The Italian settlements in Libya—now blasted by the destruction of war—were an example of what could be done by intelligent planning on these lines, under most unfavorable conditions. We must realize, though, that if Australia is to become a "promised land" for white Europeans—as America was up to the last war—they must be treated with tolerance and good humor, and not harried by interference with their social life, or by legislation against their communities inspired by cultural

bigotry. If they are made welcome, and given liberty and help so that they prosper, their children, educated in our schools, will become good Australians; and news of their success will bring more to join them in the development of this country. Otherwise, they are unlikely to uproot themselves to come to a distant land of aliens; and if they move at all, it will be to Brazil or Argentina, where the cultural atmosphere is more favorable.

The danger is that neither alternative may be accepted, but that the "short-term" outlook which is always a temptation to democratic politicians, who have the next election in view,

may prevail over the call of the higher wisdom. There will be so many complicated problems to solve; and it will seem so wanton, from the point of view of immediate expediency, to add to their number by a vast population scheme. "Let us wait a little, and deal with this or that question first"—this will be the deluding form of the old cynical whisper, "After us, the deluge." We can only hope and pray that Australia may find leaders who have eyes to see, and strength to act according to their vision; so that she may be born anew, and not die of the stagnation induced by selfishness and cowardice.



Mixed Marriages

An English diocese made a census some years ago and found that of 6,629 mixed marriages, 2,000 resulted in the apostasy of the Catholic party. In another place 19,000 mixed marriages were examined and it was found that in 11,000 cases the Catholic had given up the Faith.—CATHOLIC TIMES, *London*.



Welcome of Christ

Let no one ever prevent your coming to me. Do not think, because you are young or poor or humble, that the steps which lead to your Father's house are steep, nor, no matter how high they may be, that you cannot easily climb them. If you are young, humble, poor, wounded by life, or broken by its burdens, then my message to you is that of the Redeemer: "Come to me all you that labor and are burdened." You have a special right to be easily and always received in your Father's house.—*Pope Pius XI when Archbishop of Milan.*

What's Wrong With the "Comics"?

THOMAS F. DOYLE

Reprinted from the CATHOLIC WORLD, February, 1943

ONCE UPON a time the children of America read fairy tales. Then came the vogue of the penny dreadfuls. Now both grown-ups and children—there is at least one in every family—read the comic strips. The influence of these comics over the popular mind is one of the most striking—and disturbing—phenomena of the century. Frivolous offspring of yellow journalism, the comic strip has to a large extent ceased to be either wholesome or funny. It has become, instead, a problem to those who believe that what goes into junior's mind is as important as what goes into his body. Child specialists, in particular, condemn the crime, violence and sex that the movies dare not stress, but which are often recklessly and unashamedly exploited in the funny sheet. The situation is one, they insist, that challenges the interest of every parent.

"Comics and comic books are no longer comical," declared *The New World* (November 20, 1942), Chicago archdiocesan weekly. "They have disintegrated into cheap story books wherein exotic ideas are graphically portrayed in pictures. Here, heroes accomplish the impossible because of mystical powers originating in other planets; the ordinary and accepted methods of law enforcement are ridiculed, and the sex motif is paraded be-

fore innocent eyes in semi-nude drawings. Yet parents who shrink in horror at the thought of eight-year-olds playing with matches, give them blow-torches for their minds."

NOT ALL BAD

Not all comic strips are bad, of course. Viewed separately, many of them rate high in wholesomeness as well as entertainment value. But the innocuous humor of "Bringing Up Father" serves to emphasize rather than detract from the sordidness of "Dick Tracy" or the sexiness of "Smilin' Jack" when all three happen to appear on the same page. Linked to the comic strip, but far more trashy and harmful, are the comic magazines designed exclusively for child consumption. Protests against the comics reach a high pitch of indignation when this type of illustrated fiction is analyzed. One hundred and eighty million copies of these horror books are sold every year. At least 70 per cent of them, in the opinion of Sterling North, former literary editor of the *Chicago Daily News*, are of a nature that no respectable newspaper would think of accepting.

The villainy, gunplay and "thinly-clad vampires" depicted in these comic books induced Warden Paul Brown to bar them from Westchester County

Penitentiary. He found them most popular among the younger inmates, those from sixteen to twenty-one. In his ruling, the warden exempted the Superman strip because the violence used by the hero was "employed on the side of law and order." Superman's exploits, however, do not meet with the approval of more discerning critics. In a vulgar way this fantastic character seems to personify the primitive religion expounded by Nietzsche's *Zarathustra*. "Man alone is and must be our God," says Zarathustra, very much in the style of a Nazi pamphleteer. Like it or not, there are plenty of American children who know more about the man-wonder Superman than they do about Christ or any of the great characters of the Bible.

Among conscientious newspaper editors criticism of the comic strip is occasionally heard; but attempts to drop objectionable features are usually followed by prompt protests. The comics may be blood-thirsty, trashy or fantastic; they may deal with murder, kidnapping or jungle love, but their popularity seems to be enhanced rather than lessened on that account. *Newsdom*, defunct organ of the newspaper business, some years ago saw the need of eliminating the ghastliness in comic strips, but recognized their effectiveness in building up circulation. "It is comparatively easy," it said, "to get a reader to buy a newspaper if he is palpitatingly curious to find out how the scantily-clad heroine manages to get out of the way of a fortieth century

mysteriously death-dealing machine which threatens to blow her lovely, futuristic form to gory bits." Nevertheless, as one newspaper found when it asked for comments from its readers, there are many who strangely condemn the comics. One protestant denounced them for dealing with "murders, tortures and stuff we absolutely refuse to let the kids see in the movies." Another went as far as to suggest that the police "raid the newspapers which no longer have any respect for decency."

A NEW TYPE COMIC

Editor and Publisher, in a symposium on the newspaper of 2,000 A. D., published in its issue of April 22, 1939, quoted Walter H. Harrison, Oklahoma editor, as flatly forecasting the death of the comic strip. George Olds, managing editor of the *News and Leader*, in Springfield, Mo., thought that before the turn of the century the strips would have ceased to be thrillers and would teach history and grammar, mathematics and science, with some "clean, exciting fiction." Not long ago, Elzey Roberts, publisher of the St. Louis *Star-Times*, incensed over the trashy comics appearing even in his own columns, started publication of a strip designed for the harmless entertainment of young readers. No violence or murder marred the exploits of "Bertram," drawn by a former Chicago newspaperman, and modeled after such early comics for children as "Little Nemo."

Perhaps the issuance by *Parents' Magazine* of a new type of comic book and of a series of picture stories by the Catechetical Guild dealing with the lives of Christian heroes, discussed later, is the beginning of a more widespread effort toward replacing the paganized, erotic comics by something that parents may, with easy consciences, place in the hands of their children.

CHILDREN'S TASTE DESTROYED

Not that the policy of substituting the harmless for the harmful is expected to work out too smoothly. The strong meat on which the youngsters have been fed may have helped to destroy their taste for more wholesome fare. Certainly, Superman, who came out of comparative obscurity to become the number one favorite of both children and adults, will continue to be a formidable competitor. Children want their heroes to be well out of the ordinary. It will be hard to wean them from an Apollo-like creature who jumps over skyscrapers, soars through the air with more ease than the man on the flying trapeze, runs as fast as an express train, crushes steel with bare hands, catches bullets in his teeth, and hurls automobiles as nonchalantly as rubber balls.

Clad in his blue jersey and tights and picturesque red cape, Superman is the nemesis of every crook that crosses his path. He is the hero invincible, protector of the weak, chivalrous upholder of law and order. It is not against Superman himself that critics

as a rule protest, but the crime, deceit and treachery that provide the background for his adventures. The child who follows Superman is bound to have his head filled with plenty of horrors, particularly in his comic book habitat where he encounters villainies far too lurid for the daily newspaper.

Absurd as Superman is to mature readers, his antics were viewed very seriously by Canadian censors when he dropped out of the sky to solve in his own lightning-like fashion the war raging in Europe. A paragraph in the *Toronto Star* announced: "Superman . . . will be missing from its regular space while he completes one of his mighty and mysterious tasks." What *Star* readers were not allowed to know was that, single-handed, Superman had snatched the rival dictators of two mythical countries and set them down in no-man's land to fight the battle out alone. Watching their ludicrous behavior, disgusted soldiers threw down their arms and went back to their factories and farms. This, to war-time Canada, was more than nonsense; it was dangerous nonsense.

Superman has the greatest number of "fans" among children, but other less remarkable comic characters have become as real in the lives of grown-up Americans as their next-door neighbors. A survey conducted by *Fortune* in 1937 revealed that 51.4 per cent of America's adult population had a favorite comic strip. In top places then (this was before Superman crashed into front rank) were "Little Orphan

Annie," "Popeye" and "Dick Tracy." When Chic Young, creator of "Blondie," sought a name for Blondie's new daughter, 400,000 readers submitted suggestions. All over the country newspapers recorded the name of the winner in this national contest. Said the lucky lady of her favorite strip: "It actually is the first thing in the paper I turn to. It's so natural and true to life that I always get a kick out of it. Things that happen to the Bumsteads are always happening to folks in real life."

Comic strip characters are supposed to be deathless. When Milt Caniff, creator of "Terry and the Pirates," found it necessary for the sake of verisimilitude to "kill off" beautiful Raven Sherman, letters, telegrams and floral wreaths poured into the offices of the syndicate which sponsors the strip and the newspapers that carry it. Editorials were printed deploring the heroine's "death." The "Voice of the People" department of the New York *Daily News* devoted its space one day exclusively to letters from readers deploring her "passing." The weekly *Emporium Independent* (Pa.), which carries no comics, printed the following paragraph:

Many local fans will regret to learn that Miss Raven Sherman died this morning from injuries received when she was tossed from a speeding truck at the hands of that arch fiend, Captain Judas. More details can be found in the comic section of any daily paper this morning. The funeral will take place in the Sunday papers.

An advertisement by the *Tribune-*

News syndicate quoted a letter from Robert Choate, managing editor of a Boston daily, saying: "The *Herald-Traveler* leads all other New England newspapers in advertising year after year because of the consistent reader appeal of such features as "The Gumps." "The Katzenjammer Kids" have amused grown-ups ever since the era of the twelve-hour working day and the five-cent beer, and have helped to swell the enormous circulation of Hearst's *Comic Weekly*. Parents often take as vivid an interest in the adventures of "Mandrake the Magician" as do their children. Legions of office girls are daily enthralled by the chic creations worn by "Winnie Winkle," one of the best dressed of the comic heroines.

COMICS AS PROPAGANDA

As propaganda media, the comics have not been neglected. "Little Orphan Annie" has consistently been used to this end. Some years ago a heated controversy arose over remarks made by Annie's multi-millionaire friend, Daddy Warbucks, inimical to labor unions. When Warbucks turned his factories over to defense production his remarks for days on end had a decidedly propagandist, if patriotic tinge. Today, Orphan Annie—the little girl who never grows up—is making everybody in her town war-conscious; is even getting the "kids" to pitch in and help. "Popeye" was once reproduced in 1,500 newspapers using U. S. Navy advertisements to drum up enlistments. The spinach-

eating, one-eyed sailor urged farm boys to "sign up wit' me and you'll see th' lands of opportunitiky and romansk!" and declared that "the Navy's delicious cookin' builds ya up to a regular tower of Gibraltilki!" On Navy Day, 1941, a super 12-chapter movie serial patterned upon "Don Winslow of the Navy" was released to key both adults and youth to the exigencies of national defense.

POWERFUL INFLUENCE

Incongruous as it may appear, the comic strip is even being enlisted to teach the Bible. An Atlanta clergyman, employing a dubious brand of psychology, actually uses comic strip characters in giving religious lessons to children. A skilled artist and an expert on juvenile delinquency, this clergyman draws a picture of Superman and proceeds to explain that everyone wants to do something unusual and that, with God's help, everything is possible. One Sunday, he pointed out how Baby Dumpling and Daisy the dog from the "Blondie" strip obey Dagwood—just as Jesus obeyed Mary and Joseph when they found Him in the temple at Jerusalem and asked Him to come home to Nazareth. Capping this highly unorthodox lesson, the reverend gentleman drew a parallel between St. Peter and the dog Napoleon. The children agreed that Napoleon was loyal, friendly, curious and impetuous, as was the apostle who cut off the servant's ear in Gethsemane.

The comic strips were once described by Heywood Broun as the pro-

letarian novel of America. Arthur Brisbane called them the second element in the making of a newspaper, news being the first. Discouraging as it may be to educators and others, the comics exercise an appeal possessed by no other newspaper feature. When strikes have forced newspapers temporarily to suspend publication, hundreds of readers have telephoned or visited newspaper offices to find out what their favorite characters had been doing in the meantime. Creators of these cartoons receive mail that equals in volume the letters that pour into the studios of Hollywood's star actresses. Millions who barely take time to scan the news headlines are thoroughly familiar with the latest happenings in the pen and ink careers of Li'l Abner, Joe Palooka, Popeye or Smilin' Jack.

During a hearing on parole petitions, Criminal Judge Charles W. Lusk of Chattanooga blamed the comic strips as one of the primary causes of crime. "Frequently," he said, "I sit down and try to analyze them to see what the humor is in them. Children's minds are being charged with this even before they can read. . . . I am fully convinced that some of these strips based on some disreputable, well-nigh criminal act—whacking someone over the head, or some mean, dishonest trick—are responsible for creating ideas in the minds of children."

This seems a severe indictment, but there are many experienced observers who will agree that the newspaper comic strip very often does exercise a

definitely deleterious effect on young minds. Admittedly, a great number of the comic strips are actually harmless, but students of child psychology are slow to minimize the influence that the crime adventures of Dick Tracy may have on juvenile readers. Frank X. Reller, chief probation officer of the St. Louis Juvenile Court, blamed *Gang-Busters*—a radio program, to be sure, but not a whit more sensational than Dick Tracy—for much of the youthful crime in his district. Totalling his juvenile catch for 1939, he discovered that forty-six young law breakers took their cues straight from *Gang-Busters*, while a hundred or so used it as a sort of lexicon, as the officer found when youthful suspects greeted him with, "Listen, flatfoot, I ain't talkin' to you coppers," or some such unchildlike language. Even the little tots are likely to be affected by the pictures they see in the comic section. In Sewickley, Pa., a five-year-old child, shouting, "Here's how Superman flies," dropped thirty feet from a second floor window to a cellar-way.

Least wholesome of the daily strips are those with an undisguised sex appeal. These cartoons are skillfully drawn. They have a calculated appeal for adolescents because of their romantic content. But the romance is not always free from suggestiveness and the sleek forms of seductive charmers are paraded in modes and situations neither innocent nor harmless. Here the pen is used with a subtle skill not demanded in depicting the gaucheries of Mutt

and Jeff or in the exploits of Dick Tracy. Moralists may not worry unduly over youngsters carrying toy pistols and "sticking up" their little friends in comic strip style, but they certainly cannot condone the daily strip in which sex is the main interest and romance appears in a decidedly nasty and uninhibited guise.

AN EVALUATION

In a study of comic strips appearing in Boston newspapers, Roger C. Gay, a Harvard student in education, reported in the *Harvard Educational Review* that only twenty-six out of a total of sixty-five could be approved for child readers. This would seem a pretty fair general evaluation of the comics that are now a regular part of the nation's reading diet. Newspapers, however, are not the chief purveyors of illustrated trash for the time-wasting and morale-destroying consumption of children. The credit for this goes to the publishers of comic magazines, numbered by the score, and two-thirds of which have been described by Sterling North as "graphic insanity."

Mr. North, after an examination of these thrillers, says:

Save for a scattering of more or less innocuous "gag" comics and some reprints of newspaper strips, we found that the bulk of these lurid publications depend for their appeal upon mayhem, murder, torture and abduction—often with a child as the victim. Superman heroics, voluptuous females in scanty attire, blazing machine guns, hooded "justice" and cheap political propaganda were to be found on almost every page.

Even conceding that this editor is a harsh critic, there is still an uncomfortable amount of truth in his appraisal of the cheap "literature" that is constantly being fed to young and unformed minds:

Badly drawn, badly written and badly printed—a strain on young eyes and young nervous systems—the effect of these pulp-paper nightmares is that of a violent stimulant. Their crude blacks and reds spoil the child's sense of color; their hypodermic injection of sex and murder make the child impatient with better, though quieter stories. Unless we want a coming generation even more ferocious than the present one, parents and teachers throughout America must band together to break the "comic" magazine.

"Comic," of course, is the last word to be applied to the multitudinous outpourings of the pulp presses. There is a creepy horror about some of these fantasies suggestive of Grand Guignol. They are people with characters with weird names and still weirder attributes. "The Flash," defender of the weak, can fly so fast that the human eye cannot see him; "Johnny Thunder," who hurls thunderbolts in true Jovian fashion, can cause a flooded ship to be whipped out of the ocean, drained of its excess water and re-floated again; "The Hawkman," pursuer of evildoers, wears a hideous disguise and is aided by the discovery of a metal than can resist the pull of gravity; "The Flame," endowed with power over fire, streaks through the air like a luminous Superman; "The Black Lion" uses his phenomenal strength to fight the arch-criminal "Blitz"; "Dr. Fung" uses ancient Chinese lore to combat modern

crime; "The Mirror Man," possessor of a mysterious garment, is thereby afforded untold power in helping people in distress; "Zatara" and "Yarko" are two magicians who defy natural laws in waging their unique campaigns against the lords of the underworld.

UNREAL WORLD

It is a poor defense to say that these stories portray the triumph of justice over villainy and crime. The damning argument against these gaudy publications is that they introduce the child to an unreal world peopled by scheming sirens and cold-blooded murderers and are the worst possible education for children whose minds are too impressionable not to retain some residue of the dangerous nonsense poured into them. These tales are such that no sane parent would repeat to his children. Nevertheless, 15,000,000 of these books are sold at more than 100,000 newsstands every month. "They absorb," says George J. Hecht, publisher of *Parents' Magazine*, "75 per cent of the leisure-time reading of children nine to fourteen." He adds, significantly, "I am told that a publisher is pleased if 1,000 bookshops sell his children's books and an edition of 5,000 copies is a good sale."

Obviously parents in general are unaware of the kind of trash purveyed to their children as harmless entertainment. Surveys bear out the contention repeatedly advanced by conscientious parents that no child escapes the influence of the comics. If Johnny's father

and mother make an effort to keep him from reading the Sunday comics, he can amble over to the Smiths next door and get them from his playmates. In the same way he can borrow the horror books his parents forbid him to read. Second-hand bookstores are well stocked with these comics, so that for three cents the less well-to-do child can supply himself with any of the 125 different magazines that are issued at ten cents and bring something like \$12,000,000 a year to their publishers.

MENTAL POISONING

The mushroom growth of the comics is merely a reflection of the moral decadence that began in America after the first World War. The fact that only one newspaper in the United States—*The New York Times*—can dispense with them entirely is the best index we have to their hold on the popular taste. A nation that *demand*s trash in its newspapers and is tolerant of the mental poisoning of its young cannot be without cause for soul-searching. When Dr. Alexis Carrel, noted research specialist and author of *Man the Unknown*, declared that our race pitifully needs new supplies of discipline, morality and intelligence, he merely reiterated what outspoken critics have stressed in their campaigns to improve, or, if necessary, to abolish the comic page. "The perfect life, as viewed by the average youth," says Dr. Carrel, "is a round of ease or entertainment, of motion pictures, radio programs, parties, alcoholic and sexual

excesses." The doctor did not include the comic strip in his enumeration of youthful excesses, but even as early as 1907, the International Kindergarten Union felt compelled to call upon parents to bar Sunday comics from their homes because of the "false note" implanted by them in children's minds.

It is worth noting that the term, "yellow journalism," was coined in reference to the lurid saffron with which sensational newspapers dyed the dress of the "Yellow Kid of Hagan's Alley," progenitor of the legion of comic strip characters that now pre-empt so much space in the daily newspapers. Less than a decade after the *New York World* printed the first colored Sunday comic (November 18, 1894), M. J. Darby of the *Toronto Mail and Globe*, told the National Association of Newspaper Circulation Managers: "Whatever merits the comic supplements may have possessed in the beginning, when their creators were artists of original methods, distinctive style and freshness and fertility of humor, they have to a large extent departed." Probably the first determined effort to modify the comics was made in 1911 by the League for the Improvement of the Children's Comic Supplement, aided by the Federation for Child Study, the League of American Penwomen and the Council of Jewish Women's Child Welfare Committee.

Wartime exigencies almost accomplished what the reformers vainly sought. Publishers were perturbed when T. E. Donnelly, chief of the Pulp and

Paper Section of the War Industries Board, called for elimination or at least reduction of comic sections. However, when it became apparent that newspaper supplies were not threatened, the publishers went merrily ahead under a sort of Keep the Home Fires Burning program, holding that American democracy was being helped along by serving the cause of humor. Said a Hearst spokesman:

A publisher can render no better service than by extending circulation and providing matter which shall lighten the hearts of the people. Morale is essential to victory. We are an emotional people, and on more than one occasion our sense of humor alone has saved us.

With such sentiments ringing in their ears, newspaper publishers opened their arms to Mutt and Jeff and their long line of followers. The post-war period found the comics entrenched as an American institution. Today more than a dozen national syndicates distribute 300 comic strip features to newspapers of every size. Principal among them is King Features Syndicate which supplies 2,000 newspapers. According to *Time*, Superman, property of the McClure Syndicate, appears in seventy-seven dailies and thirty-six Sunday papers, while magazine editions of his extravagant exploits run into a million and a half copies. The popularity of the comic strip has brought fortunes to creators of the cartoons and has helped many newspapers to hoist their circulation figures to record-breaking heights. The unfortunate influence of the comics on the youth of the country

has either been ignored or deprecated in deference to their money-earning potentialities.

REMEDY MUST BE FOUND

Something must eventually be done about this national craze. Newspapers themselves can remedy the situation by exercising discrimination as to the type of strip they publish, but it is doubtful indeed if individual owners will sacrifice features that competitors continue to use with profit. Only if the backing of their readers was assured would newspapers willingly combine to end the comic strip abuse. Silas Bent, in his book, *Newspaper Crusaders*, indicates how potently the newspapers could function in this matter if popular opinion could be aroused to demand it. "Whether or not," Mr. Bent says, "Elzey Roberts of the *St. Louis Star-Times* and the editors of *Newsdom* have fired a shot into the vitals of the comic strip, it is undeniable that more than nine-tenths of the crusades undertaken by newspapers bear fruit. The fruit may be long in ripening, and often is, but it is worth nursing."

The publishers of *Parents' Magazine*, as already noted, have undertaken what may prove a really helpful step toward the substitution for horror comics of a more wholesome type of comic book. In launching three new publications—*True Comics*, *Real Heroes* and *Calling All Girls*, they seek to instruct and uplift rather than horrify and de-grade young minds. Among the features of the first issue of *True Comics*

was the life story of Winston Churchill, a chapter depicting recent scientific history, the story of Simon Bolivar, the South American liberator, and episodes in the winning of the American West.

In an article written by Clara Savage Littledale, editor of *Parents' Magazine*, she says:

The attempt to substitute good books for comic magazines is all very well, theoretically, but, practically, it doesn't work. . . . The question is, rather, what can be put in the place of the comics that will be attractive, interesting, worthwhile, and capable of satisfying the child? *Parents' Magazine* has come to the conclusion that a suitable substitute for trashy comic magazines needs to be provided—a new magazine patterned closely after the comics, a magazine that shall be *very like*, yet *very unlike* the comic magazines as we now know them.

For Catholic children, the Topix stories sponsored by the Catechetical Guild, represent a more specific and recent attempt along similar lines. "Here, for the first time," says *The New World*, the authentic lives of Christian heroes are portrayed. Their sufferings, their love of God and life are vividly authored. All are attractively presented in color. We believe that the new Topix stories render a real service to the children and parents of our nation. Now the desirable heroism of Christians whose courage and daring were directed into exemplary channels are portrayed. Damien the Leper, St. Francis of Assisi, St. Joan of Arc, and St. John Bosco ought to be fair competitors for "Dick Tracy," "Superman," "Li'l Abner," "Buck Rogers," and others.

Only time will tell what success these ventures will achieve. They are at least a reassuring indication of the growing intolerance on the part of child experts toward the baneful comic. But neither modification of the comic strip nor the successful replacement of comic magazines by true-life picture stories is likely to progress very far until parents, in particular, are aroused to their inherent responsibilities. The comic strip problem has disturbingly deep roots in the life of present-day America. It may be that to eliminate this threat to childhood many other grave problems may have to be sifted and studied.

PARENTS MUST SUPERVISE

Primarily the problem of home training and guidance. Not alone in permitting their children complete and ready access to doubtful movies and radio programs, but in failing to supervise their reading, have American parents in large numbers failed to discharge their obligations. For a healthy American boy to nourish a craving for the trashy sensationalism of the comic book is neither normal nor necessary. It simply means that his parents have lost control of him, that instead of rearing him to standards of morality and discipline they have allowed him to drift into dangerous moral currents. They have not provided the step-by-step companionship that the child needs in his formative years. They have not taught him the dignity of

work, the joy of earning rather than being *given* money to spend.

Children waste time and money when they purchase comic books. But such waste is inevitable in children who have not been taught to use their leisure for work as well as play, who have not been taught that discipline, rather than being irksome, is something they should accept as naturally as so many now rush for the comic section when father comes home with the evening paper. Health standards are high in America because parents have learned how to raise healthy children, but we are far from a comparable moral perfection. The pampered children of America are legion, but so are the careless parents who think that sending their offspring to good schools absolves them of further part in the work of building, of protecting them against outside influences that operate unseen, but nevertheless efficiently, to undo the work of both church and school.

Indiscriminate reading of news-

paper comic strips and comic magazines by children has been condemned by moralists, educators and wise parents alike. Ultimately, the fate of both must rest upon the action of the nation's parents. Individuals and organizations will continue to inveigh against this danger in vain until the guardians of the nation's youth realize that every time their children sit down to peruse a comic book their own failure as parents is being exposed. However much others may scoff at what may seem an attempt to make ascetics out of children, this much is certain: that every time a child is diverted from trashy movie, radio program or comic serial and given something constructive and character-building to do, a little will have been done toward remedying the spiritual flabbiness of which the comic strip is symptomatic. By all means let us have more of these child ascetics, for asceticism is merely another name for the vigorous and disciplined manhood that helped to build America and must save it today from its enemies.



Totalitarian Octopus

Once debase the family or weaken its strong bonds and the nation's death warrant is being signed. Wise indeed are the statesmen who have a jealous care for the family's well-being, who make its functioning easy, who make hard the path of the wrecker. Wise indeed are the rulers who jealously guard the family's rights, the God-given right of the parents to bring up their children according to their conscientious convictions.—

Most Rev. Richard Downey, D.D., Archbishop of Liverpool.

Secularization of Society

LIAM BROPHY, B.PH.

Reprinted from the IRISH CATHOLIC, December 31, 1942

THE PRESENT difficulties and distresses are so striking an argument of the Christian philosophy," writes the present Holy Father in an Encyclical Letter, "that they well point men's minds towards the Truth as nothing else would . . . Today, the false views held in earlier times have been amalgamated with new inventions and new conceptions of the human mind. And this perverse position has been pushed so far that nothing is left but confusion and disorder. The cries and axioms of laicism, as it is called, become the basis of all civil relations—a process which now sets in more actively every day and is greeted with nothing but congratulations. It is doubtful whether there ever has been an age in which men's spirits were so broken by despair, so busily alive to the difficulties of providing any remedy for their disorders."

Since the beginning of the 14th century European civilization has been undergoing a process of secularization which has increased with the advance of time, till it has arrived in our day at a crisis where it is in peril of inevitable destruction. This civilization of ours—that is, of Christendom—spreading over Europe and the New World, and sending tributaries into Africa and Asia, was the creation of the Catholic Church, which had pre-

served all that was best in the Graeco-Roman culture. To her Europe owes its cultural unity, which, more than any culture in the past, has been the creation of a religious tradition.

An examination of the growth and development of the secularizing process will show how inseparable is our civilization from the Catholic philosophy of life, and how grave is the danger which threatens it when it abandons that philosophy—the gravest affecting it, says Belloc, since first it took on its essential character, between 1,900 and 1,600 years ago.

HOW IT BEGAN

The beginnings of the secularization of European society are to be found in the Renaissance and the Reformation. Previously that society had been bound together by ecclesiastical authority, reaching a splendid harmonized unity during the Middle Ages. Kenelm Digby has given us an inspiring picture of those fertile ages when all Europe was one in the Faith:

The Middle Ages were ages of highest grace to men; ages of Faith; ages when all Europe was Catholic, when vast temples were seen to rise in every place of human concourse to give glory, to God . . . ages of sanctity which witnessed a Bede, an Alcuin, a Bernard, a Francis, and crowds which followed them as they did Christ; ages of vast and beneficent intelligence, in which it pleased the Holy Spirit to display the power

of the seven gifts, in the life of an Anselm, a Thomas of Aquin, and the saintly flock whose steps a cloister guarded; ages of the highest civil virtue, which gave birth to the laws and institutions of an Edward, a Louis, a Suger; ages of the noblest art which beheld a Giotto, a Michael Angelo, a Raffaello, a Dominichino; ages of poetry which heard an Avitus, a Caedmon, a Dante, a Shakespeare, a Calderon; ages of more than mortal heroism which produced a Tancred and a Godfrey; ages of majesty which knew a Charlemagne, an Alfred and the sainted youth who bore the lily.

This unified Europe was the antithesis of modern Europe, with her multiple national independent states and "thousand sects battling."

RENAISSANCE AND REFORMATION

With the Renaissance came the disintegration of that unity. It was a breaking away from the mediaeval culture, not, as has been often supposed, on religious grounds, but from national motives. It was a harkening back to the days of pagan antiquity, to the splendor of a past which seemed magnificent in proportion as the present appeared alien and uncouth. The cult of the beautiful was practised with religious zeal. The humanists turned their backs on the subtleties of Scholastic philosophy for the brilliance of Platonic thought. They rejected what seemed to be an over-complicated system of Christian ethics for the simplicity of the ancients.

But while the south of Europe had its splendid traditions upon which to draw, the north had no such cultural background. "Northern Europe," says

Christopher Dawson, "could only assert its cultural independence by a remoulding and a transformation of the Christian tradition itself in accordance with its national genius. The Renaissance of Northern Europe was the Reformation." Luther's revolt, too, was a reaction against the complicated in favor of the simple, "a revolt against asceticism, the intellectualism of Aristotle and St. Thomas, against the Latin tradition." It was violently opposed to the monastic and contemplative ideal, and thereby set the minds of men on the road of material progress at the cost of the spiritual life.

The Protestant Reformation resembled the Renaissance in many respects. Both movements, as Dawson points out, represent a secularization of life—a reaction from the cloister to the world, from the monastic ideal of religious contemplation to the active life of lay society. It was an age of exploration and discoveries. Astronomy, it seemed, was taking the roof from, geology the ground from, the old Faith. Rapid advances were made in science, and the material world gained supremacy over the spiritual in the minds of scholars.

The dualism which the Reformation had initiated between the inner life of the conscience and the external practical life of worldly affairs spread to all domains of human activity. In philosophy it resulted in the Cartesian system which set up a complete dichotomy between mind and body; in culture it brought about a severance of religion

and science, in politics it culminated in the *laissez faire* of Liberalism. In Protestant countries wealth increased with the growth of physical knowledge; Capitalism, the root of all our modern social unrest, arose; the fundamental idea of authority became confused till it became identified with force and dictatorship. Forces arose such as Nationalism, Humanity, Positivism, which claimed to be a substitute for Christianity, and Rationalism, which had its roots in private judgement, claimed that the human reason is the only arbiter between what is good and what is evil, between the false and the true. Socialism has reached its logical conclusion in Communism, the most materialistic social creed that the world has ever witnessed.

But the process of secularization has reached its *ne plus ultra*. It cannot advance further without destroying it-

self and ruining the entire fabric of European culture. Contact must be established once more between the social political world and Christianity, between science and religion, between the spiritual and material if that culture is not to perish. The Catholic Church is the only force on earth that can bring about that reconciliation. What Digby so clearly foresaw in England, Chateaubriand prophesied in France, as did Novalis, though a non-Catholic, in Germany—the civilization of Europe must submit to the unifying authority of the Church or be irreplaceably broken. Our Holy Father has made a most earnest appeal to the nations of Europe to return to that doctrine which welded them together and formed them in the days of their greatness, warning them that secularization of society is not a sign of progress, but of decay, of devitalization and ultimate death.



Glory in Bombing

I sincerely hope that we may never glory in the methods of modern war which we ourselves, by a strange paradox, are compelled to use in order that evil may be cast down and good come into its own. No man of humane feeling could ever glory in that degradation of human inventiveness called bombing, with its almost inevitable accompaniment—the slaughter of the innocent. Were I to declare that, in whatever future lies before us, bombing of every kind must be utterly and finally forbidden by international law, I should be voicing the universal cry of the human heart.—Owen Francis Dudley.

Youth and This Troubled World

HARRY W. FLANNERY

THIS is no usual graduation day. Graduation ceremonies in other years were more or less festive occasions. They were days for jokes and laughter, days of confidence and expectation. Young men who were graduated in classes before you looked happily upon the world into which they were to step. They had prepared themselves through years of study for activities which, in the glorious enthusiasm of youth, held forth blooming promise.

But you are being graduated in a war year. You are going forth from your college smiling, for men of courage always keep their spirits high. But there are few jokes and there is hollow laughter today, for you are stepping forth into a shattered world, one that has crashed about you. You go forth grimly, with a prayer in your heart. But you have reason to be glad you are being graduated in these serious days, for you have more chance to be of service to your people and to the world than those young men who went before you. You should be glad, first of all, that you have persevered in seeking an education, for it never had a higher value. You should be glad especially that you have a Catholic education, one of the best that the world affords.

You have an unusual opportunity because of the education that you have

An address to the Graduating Class of Loyola University of Los Angeles, February 7, 1943, by the former Berlin Correspondent of the Columbia Broadcasting System and author of ASSIGNMENT TO BERLIN.

received. Every Catholic young man should be trained in Catholic schools and colleges. They are thus fitted to be men who are not only trained in the subjects offered by other schools, but also they have what is even more important—a philosophy that is basic, one that is founded upon fundamental century-tested truths, one that gives them assurance of right, that makes them tolerant and just, that makes them men in the full sense of the word. Such an education is important for any young man in any age, but it never was more important than it is today. You can be thankful that you have this splendid training—this stout armour to shield you and sharp sword to aid you as you step forth. You can be grateful, too, that you are an American in a free world where such an education is available.

I recently was in a country where there were no such colleges as Loyola. The Nazis did not permit any religious schools to continue. Today in Nazi Germany, if you were able to go to college at all, you went to one where every subject was distorted to the end of glorifying Nazism, where you were

taught that Christianity is a failure and that Catholics were to be hated, where teachers sought to take from you any lingering reverence you might have for marriage and the family, where you were taught the gospel of the blonde Superman, but yet told that no individual is important except insofar as he can serve the State, that no man even has a right to life if he is crippled, insane or even aged, where you were schooled in *Mein Kampf* instead of the Bible, and taught to reverence Hitler instead of Christ.

FREEDOM OF EDUCATION

You are fortunate. You have been schooled in a land that is free, and one that is fighting that all men may be free. You young men, along with your fellows, are the ones who will fight and who will win this war for freedom. You have the responsibility of winning this war, of seeing that we do not lag—any of us, you and we who are older; that we do not compromise, that we win an absolute, complete victory, one in which there is no question about who is victor and who is vanquished. You must fight this war and win it in the knowledge that we are not battling just because we were attacked at Pearl Harbor and had to defend ourselves as honorable men, but because two such philosophies as ours and those of the Nazis and the Manchuria Gang cannot exist together in this world. You, as you fight, are not merely fighting against, but for. You have a flaming mission in this war—

if you carry on your responsibilities after the war, and see that we carry them on, too.

You are the men who, besides fighting this war, must see that we build a proper future world. You will meet with opposition. You will find that many other men are skeptics, that they scoff. They are those who look back; you must look ahead. They will say it cannot be done. You can answer that nothing is ever accomplished unless there are men of vision, fighting men, men of ideals, who are determined to carry on. It is in this that you have your opportunity to be of epochal service, to see that upon the ashes of victory we build a new and better world. You, as Catholic young men, not only have this responsibility; you have this obligation.

You, as Catholic young men, because of your training, because of your religion, must see that this time we do not repeat the mistakes of the past. You must see that we do not again shed our blood for slogans, and die in vain. We did that in 1918, because we shirked our responsibilities then. We then outlined fourteen points, and forgot them. We then launched the League of Nations and abandoned it. We planned a system of inspection of the industries of the conquered countries to see that they did not arm again, and we did not make those inspections. We threatened dire punishment for all those who were guilty of crimes against international law, from Kaiser Wilhelm down, named 900 persons in one

indictment, but tried only twelve in German courts with German judges, and finally convicted only six, with the longest sentence only four years. We helped establish a democracy in Germany and we helped knife it. We helped make a Germany that hated, that waited for someone to rise and lead them back into war, and found that man in Hitler.

THE MEANS TO PEACE

The last time we fought in Europe and ran from it. The last time we saw our duty during the days of war, but a burst of nationalism—of isolationism—blinded us in the days after the conflict. The last time we looked upon our responsibilities and then ran from them. We fought and fought only—in 1918—and we may fight and fight only in 1943, unless you, you young men, you Catholic young men, see that the right kind of peace is carried out in the days to come, a peace that will not bring about more war, but actually bring peace.

The way has been pointed out to you. Back through the ages, the saints, the learned men of the Church and the Popes have studied the means to peace. Back in the fourth century, St. Ambrose laid down the moral foundations of peace. St. Augustine wrote about the ideals of peace in *The City of God*. St. Thomas Aquinas, in the thirteenth century, prescribed the specific conditions which alone could justify a nation in resorting to war. Vittoria and Suarez em-

phasized the moral unity of the family of nations.

In 1917, during World War I, Pope Benedict XV made these proposals:

1. That moral right be substituted for the material force of arms in the reciprocal dealings of nations.

2. That nations enter into a just agreement for the simultaneous and reciprocal reduction of armaments.

3. That armed force be replaced by the noble and peaceful institution of arbitration, with the provision that penalties be imposed upon any State which should refuse either to submit a national question to such a tribunal or to accept the arbitral decision.

In 1920, the same Pontiff urged the association of nations in an international organization.

And today, Pope Pius XII has talked repeatedly of plans for peace. His most famous message was in his Christmas talk of 1939. At that time, the Pope offered "Five Conditions for a Just Peace." In brief, these provided:

1. Assurance of the right to life and independence of all nations, large and small, strong and weak. "One nation's will to live," he said, "must never be tantamount to a death sentence for another."

2. Nations must be liberated from the heavy slavery of the race for armaments and from the danger that material force, instead of serving to protect rights, become the tyrannical violator of them.

3. Juridical institutions shall be

established to guarantee the loyal and faithful fulfilment of terms and, in case of recognized need, to revise and correct them.

4. The real needs and just demands of nations and of peoples as well as of ethnical minorities must receive benevolent examination, and where it appears necessary, must be met by equitable, wise and harmonious revision of treaties.

5. There must be acute responsibility that measures and weighs human statutes according to the holy unshakable rules of Divine Law.

Upon these principles, students of the Church, bishops and such organizations as the Catholic Association for International Peace, have made their comments and elaborations.

CATHOLICS HAVE RESPONSIBILITY

But Catholics in general, as individuals, as persons like yourselves, have done practically nothing. They have not even studied this most important subject ever to come before them, one that affects the lives of your fathers, your brothers and perhaps even yourself, and the future of all who come after you. They have not realized that they, as Catholics, have a responsibility, a moral obligation to do all they can to see that we do not have another war in another generation. They do not realize that one is not a good Catholic just because he goes to church on Sunday, receives the Sacraments regularly and keeps the Commandments. That is only passive

Christianity. Religion means more than that kind of service to God. It means that a man seek the means of attaining the ends of God, and there never was a more splendid opportunity for Catholics to fulfil their obligations to God and all men than in seeing that we try to bring lasting peace upon earth. Try. We cannot do more. We have nothing to lose by the effort, and everything to gain. Only through striving for ideals, do men progress.

"Whatever we can do to hasten the day when the dove of peace may find on this earth, submerged in a deluge of discord, somewhere to alight," said Pope Pius XII, "we shall continue to do, trusting in those statesmen who, before the outbreak of war, nobly toiled to avert such a scourge from the peoples; trusting in the millions of souls of all countries and of every sphere, who call not for justice alone, but for love and mercy; above all, trusting in God Almighty."

All who are worthy of the name of Catholic, and you especially as youth trained in a Catholic school, must accept this responsibility. You can be glad that generally the Four Freedoms, as outlined by our President; the Eight Points of the Atlantic Charter, as subscribed by Roosevelt and Churchill, and the public statements of the leaders of this country, Britain, China and Russia, have paralleled the principles of our Popes. They speak of a peace of justice, with proper punishment for the war guilty

in Japan and Germany, but mercy for the masses of the people. They recognize that these people have a share of guilt, that they must first of all be completely defeated so that they shall learn that war does not lead to glory and dominance, but is a bloody and useless sacrifice to false gods. They plan to police the conquered countries, to restore their independence only in time, but to give them the means to normal trade and normal life, to make them a people who have no reason to hate, to want war again. They realize that, as we plan the peace, we cannot have both revenge and peace, that we must choose whether we want revenge or whether we want peace.

THE COMPLETE MAN

We have made a start toward a just peace. But there is no assurance that we shall attain it. We made brave promises last time, but we did not carry them out. We may do the same this time—unless you, you Catholic youth, lead in this modern crusade.

You, as a Loyola trained young man, must take up the torch that is handed to you.

You are, according to that splendid description I find in one of your publications, eminently qualified for this world task before you. That passage to which I refer speaks of "The Loyola Man, a Citizen of Two Worlds." Today, as you are being graduated, nothing better could be spoken, as ringing words to echo with you through the years:

The Complete Man is an able man, clear in thought, rich in vision, vigorous in act; he is a man learned in the arts and sciences, a student of history with a sharp, sound view of his own times, a right interpretation of the past, a true concept of the future; he is a man who lives life fully and vividly, gladly accepting the challenge of life, exulting in its adventures; finally—and most important—he is a good man: warm of heart, gentle, seeking the right, charitable in thought as well as deed—in a word, a Christian gentleman.

Loyola develops the Complete Man by training his faculties—his mind, his imagination, his will; by instructing him in right knowledge, by making him at home in the arts and sciences, by preparing him for service to his country and his fellow-man, teaching him his rights and duties as a member of society; and, by inspiring him to right living, making him aware of the obligations of his immortality, and setting before him the teaching, the example, and the divine beneficence of Christ.

Loyola aims to train a man for success and for possible greatness; but whatever a man's worldly achievements, Loyola's training insists that his design of living include the fulfilment of his obligations toward God and his own soul, prepares him thus to be, in the best sense, a Complete Man, a Citizen of Two Worlds.

Because you are a Catholic, because you are a Loyola man, a Complete Man, you can face bravely this broken world. You can help fashion it boldly into a world worthy of your dreams.

The Chinese word "crisis" is com-

posed of two characters: "danger" and "opportunity." You are facing the danger. Let all of us—bravely, and above all, prayerfully—grasp this opportunity that is ours.

You go forth today in the most splendid crusade of all times—for freedom and for justice and for lasting peace. Our most fervent prayers go with you.



Religion in the Prison Camps

A French officer returned from a German prisoners of war camp contributes to *La Vie Spirituelle* an account of life in the Oflags (camps for officers). In each camp for officers, he writes, there is a chaplain-general who is a voluntary prisoner. Each group of four blocks of buildings wherein the prisoners are housed constitutes a "parish," which has its own religious life, and is in charge of a priest-prisoner who is responsible to the chaplain-general. One hut, measuring 10 metres by 30, is permanently reserved for religious purposes: half of it, holding some 500 men, serves as a chapel, where the Blessed Sacrament is reserved; while the other half is used variously as a sacristy, a chapel for Protestant services, and a meeting-place for sodalities. Each priest says Mass daily, and every Mass is well attended: and on Sundays there is a solemn High Mass at 9 o'clock, at which the camp's *schola* provides the Gregorian chant.

But in the Stalags (camps for rank and file), says this officer, conditions are not so favorable. The Papal Nuncio is not allowed to visit them. A book entitled *Ecclesia*, which the Vatican Polyglot Press published in September, summarizing the works of charity performed by and through the Holy See to bring relief to prisoners and civilian victims of the war, describes how the Papal Nuncios are allowed freely to visit the camps for prisoners of war and civilian internes in Great Britain, Egypt, Palestine, India, Canada, the United States and Italy: the only exceptions are Germany and Japan and the German-occupied countries in Europe: there the Nuncio may not go.

According to a recent report in *La Croix*, quoting the Vatican Radio, one-third of the French prisoners are unable to fulfill their religious duties. There are prisoners, says *La Croix*, who have not been able to receive the Sacraments since the Battle of France.—THE TABLET, London, January 23, 1943.

THE EDITORIAL MIND

A Christian Voice

A ROMAN CATHOLIC pulpit is the one place left in Germany in which a man may publicly criticize Nazism, and remain free to do so again. Yet none the less it demands independence of character and great courage for a priest to witness to the principles of the Church in Nazi Germany, and the Bishop of Berlin, Graf von Preysing, showed such courage in his Christmas pastoral letter. It said no word of Nazism directly; but its every sentence was a vindication of the philosophy which totalitarianism denies.

The letter was an exposition of the supremacy of the natural law which is identified in theology with the law of God. "Change your mode of thinking," wrote the bishop. "Right is something which must be enforced even against the interest of the individual and the nation. . . . If power creates and represents right, there can be no peaceful communion between individuals or nations, and the fight of all against all will result. . . . No power on earth may venture to force the individual to make declarations or commit acts which would be against his conscience or against the truth. . . . All primeval rights enjoyed by mankind, namely, the right to live, to exist

unharmd, to be free, to have preferences, to contract marriage, the existence of which does not depend upon the arbitrary dictum of governments, may not be taken from any one who is not of our blood or of our language."

There, with obvious reference to Nazi treatment of Jews as well as Christians, speaks the Church of the Martyrs, which in the day of Caesar-worship (which was the early pattern of Fascist political belief) witnessed against the deification of the State, and for the value of the individual. If all churchmen were so brave, the Christian Faith would see a revival greater than has been known for centuries; and Preysing does not stand alone. He has fellows, not all of his fold, in many countries of occupied Europe.—NEW STATESMAN, *February 6, 1943.*

Entangling Alliances

WHILE there is a growing public acceptance of the need for some form of post-war world organization in which the United States must participate in order to insure a just and lasting peace, this fact should not blind us to the struggle ahead before such organization is achieved. Forewarned is forearmed.

The spirit of isolationism, dormant

now, will resurge when hostilities cease, for the very fact that we as a nation will be exhausted by the conflict. There will be a strong desire to rest and let post-war adjustments take care of themselves. Doubtless the words of Washington in his Farewell Address will be much quoted as counseling this nation to remain aloof from all "entangling alliances."

In this connection, it is well to repeat some observations on this phrase made by a speaker at the recent regional students' conference at Marygrove College. The speaker said that the warning against "entangling alliances" gives no valid argument against world order, or American participation in international organization.

His reasons? "Entangling alliances" is not a quotation from Washington's address. What he wrote was: "It is our true policy to steer clear of permanent alliances with any portion of the foreign world. . . ." His words, "Any portion of the foreign world," plainly refer to the so-called "balance of power" politics of his day. Today this country is faced by a totally different set of conditions. As Christopher Dawson has pointed out, "Down to the beginning of the twentieth century international politics were still a closed field reserved to the European powers, and the rest of the world provided a passive background for their maneuvers."

Such conditions do not exist today. If there is one outstanding characteristic of the beginning of World War

II it is the complete collapse of the "balance of power" political theory before the onslaught of the totalitarian regimes. Ever more clearly there emerges the necessity of a stable world organization of the type and characteristics outlined by Popes Benedict XV, Pius XI and the present Pius XII.

Widespread education will be needed to completely expose the fallacy of isolationism to the general public so that support may be won for a world organization guided by the principles of the natural and moral law, the sole force outside the States which can dictate to all States.—*The MICHIGAN CATHOLIC, March 25, 1943.*

Education Pact

THERE is, or should be, in education a four-cornered alliance, the object of which is to benefit the child. The parties to this alliance are:

(a) The parents, who have a duty to educate their offspring.

(b) The teacher, to whom the parents may delegate some of their rights and duties.

(c) The Church, which has a Divine commission to teach the truths of religion.

(d) The State, which has the duty of supervising education, as all else, to ensure that it is carried out for the common good.

Where there is unity of belief, there is no great difficulty about the proper functions of the respective partners in the alliance. But when they

differ on principles, as unfortunately is the case in our own day and country, then one party invariably tries to usurp some of the rights of the others.

This clash is considerable, even though it has no proper basis. All parties must agree that truth is the only education; where they differ is in what truth is, and even whether truth is a fixed and absolute thing.

It is here that the Church asserts her Divine prerogatives, insisting on the need for an absolute. She insists on her teaching rights only in so far as they affect her own children, and where necessary founds and maintains schools of all grades where her children may receive the education she desires.

The State, having the guardianship of the common good, cannot be indifferent to the education of its citizens. It must see that sufficient schools are available; it must place schools and teachers at the service of the parents.

Obviously there should be no conflict between Church and State; both want the highest good. Unfortunately all too often they are thinking on different planes. There is no basis of agreement.

The State errs, even in the best of circumstances, when it claims a monopoly in matters of education; when, at the same time, its eyes rise no higher than the material order, its actions are foolish, and have repercussions on itself and its citizens.

If the State uses force to compel parents to send their children to schools which offend their Christian

conscience it is acting unjustly, and in excess of any possible powers.

Yet properly regarded the "four-power pact" for education is the best and most direct means of achieving true education in the economic system in which we live. The cause of conflict is the steady alienation of the rights of parents and Church by bodies which are ignorant of the proper aim of all education. After centuries of drift it is hardly to be wondered that legislatures are not cognizant of right principles, but the principles do exist, and should be heeded if education is to have any real meaning.—THE CATHOLIC TIMES, *London, January 22, 1943.*

Catholic Responsibility

TO BE A Catholic is to carry a special responsibility. It is extraordinary how lightheartedly people forget how heavy this the light that failed. Darkness is, by definition, only an absence of light—in other words we of the Church have not shone before men. They have not heard and seen the truth either in our conduct or our words. We are to blame for the darkness. And on the last day, God will say: "Depart, ye unprofitable servants."

We are failing first because we are as ignorant as those we should enlighten. How many of us Catholics realize that our religion is a whole way of life, a complete philosophy which covers not only our personal duty to God but our social duty to our neigh-

bors, our responsibilities as citizens of our nation and of the world? The social teaching of the Church is still regarded as an extra. Yet in the last fifty years, the great majority of the Popes' Encyclicals have dealt with social questions. And the questionings and torments of the modern world are all concerned with social questions.

This point is the second factor in the Catholic failure—isolationism. Because we Catholics have not, in so many cases, bothered to learn the kind of answers people were looking for, we find ourselves at a loss in our contacts with non-Catholics.

And all too often we have preferred the solution of not mixing with them to the more strenuous and courageous solution of working for the knowledge that would have helped them. If we went out, we should find prejudices to be fought, and differences to overcome. But we should also find a surprising amount of common ground, inherited from a religious past which, before the "Reformation," was Catholic from the great tradition of the Natural Law, which particularly in America and Britain, has survived longer than the belief in God which gives it its sure foundation.

We have, therefore, to break our isolation. Divided though we may be by high questions of theology and church discipline from other religious communions, the differences which divide us from totalitarians, pagans, materialists, opportunists, skeptics, hedonists and all other schools of

thought which deny the dignity of man, are so deep and appalling, and the power of the new materialism so great, that in sheer common sense we must unite—in the domain of the natural law, in the civic order—to preserve and build a society which, if not fully Christian, is at any rate human.—*Barbara Ward in THE TIMES, Los Angeles, January 8, 1943.*

England Reads the Danger Signal

WHILE the American birth preventionists, under the banners of birth control and family spacing, are diverting to their destructive movement energy needed for the war and social betterment efforts, English leaders are voicing their profound concern over the dwindling population of their nation.

The *New York Times* in a recent special article quoted Home Secretary Herbert Morrison as saying that the size of the average British family must be increased considerably after the war to maintain the population near its present level.

The same day, Roy Harrod of Christ Church College, Oxford, expert on population statistics, asserted that if the birthrate continued to decline at the present rate, the population would inevitably be decreased by a quarter every twenty-eight or thirty years.

The United States is likewise approaching a point where, unless the trend is reversed, we shall have a steadily decreasing population. In the

meantime, the population of the totalitarian countries is growing steadily.

One of the major difficulties of the democracies today is lack of manpower. General Giraud, quoted in the February 1 issue of *Life* magazine, listed the practice of birth control first among the causes of France's collapse.

If it were not for the birth control movement, the United States would now have hundreds of thousands and indeed millions of additional young men of military age to defend this nation. No one, therefore, has more reason to be grateful to the birth controllers of America than Hitler and his allies.

If it were not for the resolute

stand of the Catholic Church against birth control, the difficulties of this nation would be infinitely worse. There would have been no five Sullivan brothers to help man the U.S.S. Juneau. There would be few of the other numerous brother combinations, two, three, four, five, six and more to battle for their country in the army, the navy, the marines. There would be fewer young women to relieve men for front line duty by service in the WAACS and the WAVES. But the birth controllers continue, with a zeal that amounts to frenzy, to push the United States down what General Giraud terms "the slope of suicide."—*The CATHOLIC NEWS, New York, March 6, 1943.*

Men Make Civilization

What many learned and earnest planners of the postwar period do not seem to grasp is that for the creation of a new order of things something more than organization or governmental machinery is required. All postwar planning is futile that is not realistic enough to see that it is not techniques of organization and systems of government that create civilization, but men. The minds and hearts of men are the nursery beds in which all growth of civilization must be fostered. Civilizations are not better than the men who make them.—*In Lenten Pastoral of 1943 by the Most Rev. Aloisius J. Muench, D.D., Bishop of Fargo.*



Prayer and Penance

Our lives must be more earnestly and perseveringly Christian, and, since the frenzy of our visible enemies is like that of the man possessed by evil spirits, we must remember that this kind is not cast out save by prayer and penance.—*Arthur Cardinal Hinsley.*

World Police

REV. CHARLES BRUEHL, PH. D.

Reprinted from THE WANDERER, St. Paul, February 11, 1943

THE police force is the instrument of the law. It presupposes the existence of law, of an established order and of a constituted governmental authority. It is exercised in the name of the government which is responsible for the preservation of order and has the duty to secure the safety of the citizens and to promote their general welfare. It belongs to the civil administration and is essentially distinct from the military side of governmental activity. As a rough and ready definition we may accept the following: "That department of government that maintains and enforces law and order." From this it would appear that the police power is subordinated to the larger purpose of government from which it cannot be dissociated.

The dignity of the police function derives from the law which it enforces and the order which it duly protects and safeguards. Now the law is a beneficent agency in social life, and order is the indispensable prerequisite of human well-being. A police power that did not have definite laws to enforce and a definite order to preserve and promote, would be empty and meaningless. Law and order constitute the contents of the policing activities which can be properly carried out only in an organized community, for only

such a community can confer the necessary authority.

Self-protection and self-defense, which is rightfully resorted to where the social life has not yet taken on actual form, are not an exercise of the police power, since under these conditions both the social authority and the relation to the common good are lacking. Even organized self-defense remains an individual affair and has recourse to such means as promise safety. It is not concerned with the punishment of the offender but only with the removal of the danger; in most cases it is quite satisfied with the driving out of the malefactor. It settles the issue in its own way. The police force on the contrary envisages the peace and tranquillity of the entire community and views whatever disturbance has been committed in its social perspective. Moreover, it does not deal with the offending individual in its own way but brings him to justice, which manifestly implies the existence of courts of justice and legal machinery. The police power also rests on a legal basis which prevents arbitrariness in its exercise.

Behind the police power stands the majesty of the law and public authority, which accounts for the respect in which it is held and the ready

cooperation which it usually finds. As a natural consequence, the influence and efficacy of the police is vastly greater than the material force which it enjoys. The little phrase "In the name of the law," has a tremendous power and opens many doors. The police is a moral power to which men readily bow and of which even the criminal stands in awe. Aptly Sir Paul Vinogradoff says: "It has been often pointed out that public order in the broad sense of the word is maintained not by a few policemen, but by the more or less explicit approval of the public at large" (*Outlines of Historical Jurisprudence*). Whilst the abominable slogan, "Might is Right" is utterly false, the converse "Right is Might" is eminently true. If the majority of men did not in their innermost conscience pay tribute to the sacred character of Right, it could not be enforced.

RIGHT FOUNDATION

Now there has recently been much talk of a world police, of an international body to prevent aggression and to secure peaceful relations among the peoples of this globe. If this idea is rightly carried out, it is well calculated to bring about the desired result. It is very important, however, to keep in mind that the police power is not the first thing and that it cannot operate in a vacuum. The police force must represent a law, stand for social order, function in an organized community and be invested with real authority. If these conditions are not realized, we

cannot speak of a police in the true and full sense of the term. Unless a real world community is established we can occupy other countries but we cannot police them. That would be a military affair. Military occupation may be a necessary expedient but it has nothing in common with world organization. It will not bring us any nearer to world unity.

Unquestionably, an international police is necessary but it must have the right foundation. The strength of an international police lies in the moral respect which it is able to command, on the appeal which it can make to the world conscience. A genuine world police will be far stronger than the armies it can commandeer. On the other hand, an army occupying in a military sense the defeated countries would, to be effective, have to outnumber considerably the police force sufficient to keep the world at peace. An army can impress only by its numbers and the array of war engines; its power belongs to the physical and material order. The power of the police force is predicated on its moral prestige. The mystery, if mystery there is, resolves itself into this that the police body represents law, order, authority, right, justice, morality, conscience, the general opinion of mankind, the ordered processes of judicial court procedure, protection against injustice and wrong.

A world police will be the natural outcome of some form of a world community, of some supernatural organization, of some international authority.

Without these the world police would lack proper foundation. A world police, we should not forget, is also a mighty educational agency since it inculcates respect for right, appreciation of order, a realization of the benefits of law, a better understanding of justice; it would destroy the belief in force as an instrument of human betterment and in war as a ferment of

progress; it would acquaint men with the blessings of security and teach them that there are better ways to national safety and integrity than ruinous armaments. In opposition to an army, a police force would be regarded as friendly and protective. But it must be a world police, that is the world policing itself, not a few nations policing the rest of the world.



Midsummer Meditation

In the *Summa Theologica* of St. Thomas Aquinas, Part II, Section II, Question 168, Article 4, the problem is discussed whether insufficient recreation is a sin. The answer is, of course, in the affirmative, for various reasons. Firstly, because it's irrational not to relax occasionally; second, because one has no business to annoy other people by not sharing in the reasonable fun of the community.

We admit that the sin of insufficient recreation is one that few commit voluntarily. There may even be those who find it superfluous to reflect during their holidays that they are performing a moral duty, enforced by the greatest of Christian philosophers. It is, however, worth remembering that the Christian and Catholic program of life is a balanced one, in which play has its place just as definitely as work. Perhaps during the summer, when most of us do get some vacation, we may remind ourselves, too, that the injustice of society appears nowhere more strongly than in the fact that so many have insufficient opportunities for recreation, or opportunities which are inconvenient and vulgar.

Lest, however, this meditation become too serious, we would refer those who have vacations to enjoy to another passage in the *Summa*, which takes up the problem: "whether greater sobriety is required of distinguished persons?" The answer is that sobriety is incumbent upon all in equal degree, but it must be striven after with special vigor by young men and bishops!—New AMERICAN CHURCH MONTHLY.

I Admire the Jehovah Witnesses

JOHN S. KENNEDY

Reprinted from COLUMBIA, January, 1943

I ADMIRE THE Jehovah Witnesses.

What's that?

I admire the Jehovah Witnesses.

That's what I said and what I meant to say.

Let me explain. I do not admire them for their ignorance, their exhibitionism, their fanaticism, their bigotry or their misrepresentation of those who do not agree with them. But I do admire them for their solidarity; their devotion to a cause; their close study and assimilation of their curious creed and its implications; their willingness and eagerness to spread their doctrine; their readiness to brave ridicule and even physical violence in the course of what they consider to be their apostolate; their unquenchable devotion to their peculiar principles, whatever the consequence to themselves.

They are people of remarkable energy and enthusiasm, worthy of a better cause. Or perhaps I should say, of a *good* cause, for theirs is exceptionally bad. One sometimes hears allegations that the whole movement is a racket, turning a neat profit. All I can say is that the ordinary Witness whom I have met either gets no cut of the alleged profits or salts all his share away. For he or she is likely to be thin, giving no evidence of eating well; to be plainly or poorly dressed; to be badly in need

of new glasses; and to be traveling on foot, sometimes dragging around a burdensome portable phonograph for playing recordings of the late "Judge" Rutherford's inflammatory gibberish.

CHAOTIC HASH OF ABSURDITIES

They know their doctrine. They can talk it for hours. They can rattle off Scripture texts by the page. They are prepared to meet objections. Now this is a remarkable accomplishment. For their doctrine is as weird and chaotic a conglomeration as could be devised even by an opium-smoker. It is without logic or coherence. At its best it is arbitrary and at its worst it is nightmarish. To master such a hash of absurdities is no mean feat. I am not praising the Witnesses for their critical faculty or their intellectual honesty. It is appalling that human reason, however primitive, can stomach such riotous nonsense. But certainly this is a striking manifestation of devotion. I am sure that most of these people do not learn easily. A great deal of hard work has gone into the memorizing of all this balderdash. It is true that the "answers" to objections are breathtaking in their audacious irrelevance. But the point is that those who mouth them have labored mightily to commit to memory such infinitely silly formulae.

Then there is their missionary spirit, their voluntary acceptance of hard and often unpleasant work in order to spread their perverse gospel. As I have remarked, they trudge many miles daily, in the summer's withering heat and in the winter's torturing cold, up one street, down another, ringing doorbells, climbing stairs, taking rebuffs, reciting again and again and again their set speeches, repeatedly assembling and dismantling their talking machines, distributing literature, returning for another call where there was no one at home, and so forth.

I have seen one of them standing on Forty-Second Street in New York on one of the worst days in January, with the temperature low, a cutting wind blowing relentlessly, and sleety snow whipping down. But there the Witness stood, offering to the hurrying passers-by the books and pamphlets of the prolific "Judge." He was getting no attention at all. But that was his post and he stuck to it.

I remember, too, a summer day at a shore resort not readily accessible. So intense was the heat that the vacationers were spending their time either in the water or on the shaded, screened porches. The beach was like a raging furnace. No one cared to move any more than was absolutely necessary. Yet two or three Witnesses made their rounds, calling at every cottage, and putting on their grotesque vaudeville show as often as they could. How they got to the resort no one knew. There was no sign of an auto-

mobile which might have brought them. Probably they had traveled, laden with all their variegated paraphernalia, on the ramshackle bus. That was their job for that day, and, come what might, they did it.

Another point is brought up by this last incident. The Witnesses are not at all afraid of a hostile or indifferent reception. The resort of which I speak was peopled by an overwhelming majority of Catholics. The non-Catholic families were very few, no more than ten percent at the most. Such was the case year after year, and everyone knew it. If the Witnesses had not dropped down suddenly from the moon, *they* knew it. Much of their oral and written propaganda is virulently anti-Catholic. But they walked straight into what might have been for them a lions' den and, without hesitation or apology, launched upon their sales talk.

THEY DRIVE THEMSELVES MERCILESSLY

For the Witnesses nothing matters but the cause.

They drive themselves mercilessly. Almost zestfully they wade right into the strongest-running tide of opposition. They do not scruple to make spectacles of themselves in order to draw attention to what they conceive to be their crusade of righteousness. When they hold a convention, they literally stand the convention town on its ear. They see to it that no one save blind and deaf shut-ins is unaware of their presence and their purpose.

Again, they make use of every possible device for disseminating their doctrine. There is the endless house-to-house canvass. There are papers. There is an abundance of pamphlets and books, with lots of illustrations, fantastic but eye-catching. There are phonograph records. There are radio broadcasts. No one can doubt that they believe this gargantuan nonsense of theirs, believe it firmly and passionately, and are afire to communicate it to others.

Finally, they are willing to accept the consequences of their principles without budging an inch. The flag-salute business is a case in point. If you will, call their stand in the matter unreasonable, even inexplicable; call their intransigence mere stupid stubbornness. But don't ignore it. Don't attempt to laugh it off. Hostility, popular reprisals, legal penalties, all these they will accept rather than compromise what they take to be sacred principles. They stick by their guns.

In view of all the foregoing, you may wonder whether I am thinking of becoming a member of the Witness sect. Hardly. Credit me with the minimum intelligence and you will know that I am not. I have been hard put to read so much as a single Rutherford pamphlet in its entirety. This doctrine is unreason at its most extravagant and spite at its sorriest. It is in opposition to divine teaching, to the Scriptures, to history. It is frequently self-contradictory. Its appeal is to a mind too narrow to house a single hair of its

owner's head, to black ignorance and wild prejudice.

What I am trying to do is to call forcibly to your attention the indubitable and very sad fact that the partisans of this calamitous creed are far more enthusiastic, enterprising, resourceful, hardworking and persistent in trying to spread it, and in witnessing to it, than are most of us Catholics in doing the same for the Divine truth, cogent, beautiful and world-saving in its power, which has been directly entrusted to us by the Son of God Himself.

RUTHERFORD ZEAL

There is no comparison, of course, between Catholic doctrine and the Rutherford rag-bag. It is like comparing a diamond and a piece of glass; pure gold and a bit of yellow paper. There is no comparison between the respective leaders, Jesus Christ and the strange Pastor Russell or the dour "Judge." There is no comparison between the record of accomplishment of the Catholic Church and that of the Rutherford circus. Nor is there any comparison between the ends and means of the one and of the other.

But there is a comparison, or rather a really appalling contrast, between the missionary zeal of the ordinary Rutherfordite and that of the ordinary Catholic. Most of us have become too settled, too sedate, too selfish. We shudder with distaste if we chance upon St. Paul's words:

I think God has sent forth us the apos-

ties last of all, as men doomed to death, seeing that we have been made a spectacle to the world. . . . We are fools for Christ. . . . We are weak. . . . We are without honor. . . . We hunger and thirst, and we are naked and buffeted, and have no fixed abode. And we toil, working with our own hands. We are reviled, and we bless, we are persecuted and we bear with it, we are maligned and we entreat, we have become as the refuse of this world, the offscouring of all.

Yet we should face these words. We should read them over slowly and apply them to ourselves, then to the Jehovah Witnesses, and ask which of the two better fits into this inspired description of the apostolate.

DO THEY SURPASS CATHOLICS?

Looking dispassionately at the Witnesses, we shall have to confess that they far surpass us in several ways.

First, they know the queer teachings of their erratic sect far more thoroughly than we know the glorious treasures of the Catholic religion. How many of us could go from house to house giving an explanatory talk on even the principal articles of the Creed? How many of us would be ready to answer questions afterwards, even if we could give such a talk? There is little likelihood that we shall be called on to undertake a house-to-house canvass in the interest of our religion, although more of us could undertake the street preaching apostolate wherein Catholic laymen are engaged to very good purpose.

But for most of us there is the apostolate of every day. That is, in the

factory, in the office, in the store, at the lunch table, in the bus, in the course of social visiting. A non-Catholic speaks slightly of indulgences or of Purgatory, not so much from malice as from misinformation. Here is a chance for us. What happens? Very often we are mute, knowing that our own grasp on these matters is too imperfect to give an explanation both clear and concise.

Again, the matter of birth prevention may come up. Some of us will do what a Catholic of my acquaintance did on such an occasion. He said that the practice was wrong for Catholics, but all right for non-Catholics because they did not come under the authority of the Church. Here was a magnificent opportunity for a few words about the natural law, binding on all men, but it was missed; worse than that, the fact of the natural law was as good as denied. "Your Church opposes Communism because, economically, socially, and politically, your Church is reactionary." That challenge is not infrequently laid down. And it stays laid down! We don't pick it up. We don't know enough to pick it up. We aren't interested enough to learn enough to pick it up.

Why? Because we lack the zeal which the Witnesses have in immeasurable abundance. How many of us have been instrumental in bringing one solitary non-Catholic to the Way, the Truth and the Life? Call for a show of hands on this question in any Catholic group and see how poor is

the response. Yet each of us has an apostolate to perform. Our task in life is not merely to save our own souls, but to help others to do the same. We were not meant to get to heaven alone. The economy of grace is not an individualistic economy. Good is diffusive of itself, the theologians tell us. What greater goods are there, for us mortals, than God's truth and God's grace? We Catholics are the possessors of these. But we dam them up. We shut them away. We bury them in the dark day of ourselves and do not let them touch and influence others who know them not. We hide them under a bushel, when we should be putting them on the mountain top of our lives to burn and to shine.

To be conscious of our obligatory apostolate is something, but it is not enough. It is merely the preliminary to hard work discharging our duty of communicating Christ's good news. We take it for granted that the generality of people knows that good news. After all, we say, wasn't it first announced twenty centuries ago and hasn't it since been ceaselessly repeated? Yes. But the fact is that, in our time, it has become more and more unknown. Every previous generation got something of the Christian truth in its upbringing, but there are millions of our contemporaries, of our fellow-Americans, who have grown up baldly ignorant of it.

I have talked to groups of non-Catholics at their invitation. On these occasions I have made it a point to

present straight Christian doctrine just as strongly as I could. I have been amazed to find that what I said seemed completely novel to some of those present. For them, and countless others like them, I presume, Christ has become a shadowy historical figure, relatively insignificant, mute and wholly unrelated to them. And of the contents of the Christian creed they are sadly ignorant.

PRIVATE CATHOLICS

We speak of the necessity of the Christian home and family, of Christian civilization, of a Christian social order, of a Christian peace. The realization of any of these presupposes the existence of genuinely Christian people, people Christian by conviction, people aware of the meaning of the Gospel and alive with grace. But today there are not enough such to bring about any of these things on a large scale. Yet there are hundreds of millions of Catholics in the world, tens of millions of Catholics in the United States. Why do they count for so little? Why are they swallowed up in the secularized mass? Because they are *private* Catholics, not public Catholics. They do not work at the apostolate.

A passion for "respectability" rules most of us. Conformity to the neutral, non-religious norm is our ideal. We should hate to be conspicuously Catholic, or freakishly Catholic as one Catholic woman said of another who proposed to set up a pamphlet rack in the railroad station of a large city. W

may even be like the man who counted it a proud accomplishment that he had worked for twenty years in one place of business without any of his associates knowing that he was a Catholic. The loudly contentious Catholic, always taking umbrage, always looking for a fight, is not the truly representative Catholic. Belligerence and militancy are different things. But militancy and pusillanimity are also different things. "There is a type of Catholic that runs to cover whenever he sniffs the possibility of a challenge," one observer said. But another thought the statement inaccurate. "Those people can't run for cover," he said, "because they never come out from under it." Exaggerated? Cynical? A little of each, perhaps, but not without truth.

We Catholics are in danger of looking on prudence as the only virtue. And even when we have done that, we do not understand prudence aright, for it means to us compromise, safety first, selfish calculation. There are no traces of any such caricature of a virtue in the Gospels. What compromise did Christ make with the desecrators of His Father's house, with the misleaders of the people, with the rich young man, with Herod or Pilate or His executioners? What compromise did the Apostles make with the pagan world when they entered into battle with it? What compromise did the martyrs make? All of them were considered extremely imprudent by their contemporaries. Whom has time vindicated? Whom will eternity vindicate?

We are all but paralyzed by the spirit of compromise. We take extraordinary liberties with the law of God and the law of the Church so as not to "embarrass" non-Catholics. And all the time they are looking at us with mocking eyes, knowing well that we are being cowards. Is this the way to convince and convert them?

CHANNELS OF PUBLICITY

The Witnesses, we have said, shrewdly exploit the various channels of publicity to get their message across. We do not altogether neglect these means of sowing the good seed, but we use most of them far too little, far too ineptly, far too half-heartedly. Perhaps twenty-five millions of us in the United States—and where is our daily paper? We have our diocesan weeklies. I work on one of them and know the problems that beset such publications. But the honest man has to admit that our papers are not doing the job they could and should be doing. They are not good enough. They are not interesting enough. They are not well-circulated enough. Our magazines are too few, too amateurish (save in some half-dozen instances), too little known. We publish an abundance of pamphlet literature. A fraction of it is excellent, a great deal of it is mediocre.

But the big point about all this printed presentation of the Church's message is that it has no appreciable impact on our non-Catholic fellows. It is largely unknown to them. They have never heard of it. As far as a

considerable portion of it is concerned, that is both understandable and not to be regretted. But what is worthy in it should be put in the hands of non-Catholics. It should be brought to their attention. It isn't. It might as well be written in Hindustani so far as they are concerned. Think of how the Witnesses press their tracts and their books on one and all. Then think of how we keep such respectable and interest-compelling publications as we have, completely to ourselves, and to a tiny minority of ourselves, at that.

For many years now radio has been an established medium of publicity. The Witnesses have not neglected it. We have made little effective use of it. There are exceptions to this generalization, but they are few, and

even they are not consistently exceptions. Our programs soon degenerate into routine affairs, dull, stereotyped, poorly prepared and poorly presented. Most of them do not take into consideration the needs and the mentality of non-Catholic listeners. Pietistic trash is not what bewildered strangers to the Faith are going to find intriguing and persuasive. Our programs are littered with it.

There is no end to the apostolic age. It will be in progress as long as there are men on earth. In our day, particularly, there is crying need of evangelizing the dechristianized, despiritualized multitudes. The Jehovah Witnesses' work is a reproach to us. They are wiser than the children of light.



Fall of France

The real reason for the collapse of France is the death of French patriotism. But why did patriotism die?

Because patriotism is a Christian virtue and when Christianity is assailed, patriotism is bound to suffer. Consider what the Third Republic did to the Catholic Church in France. After the victory of anti-clericalism, religion ceased to be a matter of serious concern to successive Governments. The State had, in fact, officially abolished it, and saw no necessity for putting anything in its place.

Here lies the final reason for the material and spiritual collapse of the Third Republic.—SOUTHERN CROSS, *Buenos Aires*, Nov. 27, 1942.

Pius XII Consecrates World to Mary Immaculate

The following prayer was broadcast by the Holy Father to Portugal on November 1, 1942 marking the culmination of observances commemorating the twenty-fifth anniversary of the apparition of the Blessed Virgin at Fatima

QUEEN of the Most Holy Rosary, Help of Christians, Refuge of Mankind, thou who vanquishest in all Battles of God, suppliant before thy throne, We prostrate Ourselves, confident of obtaining thy mercy, grace and necessary aid in the present calamity, not because of Our merits, on which We do not presume, but solely through the boundless goodness of thy maternal heart.

To thee, to thy Immaculate Heart, We, as Common Father of the Great Christian Family, as Vicar of Him to Whom all power is given in Heaven and on earth and from Whom We have received the care of souls redeemed by His blood and inhabiting the entire world; to thee, to thy Immaculate Heart, in this tragic hour of human history, We entrust, We consign, We consecrate not only the Holy Church, Mystical Body of thy Son Jesus, which is suffering and bleeding in so many places and is afflicted in so many ways: but all the world, rent by deadly discord, inflamed by the passion of hate, victim of its own iniquities.

May the widespread material and moral ruin, the sorrows and agonies of countries, of mothers, of wives, of brothers, of innocent children move thee to compassion. So vast a number of lives cut off in the flower of youth, bodies shattered in horrible slaughter, souls tortured and agonized and in peril of being lost eternally!

Mother of Mercy, implore God to grant us peace and, above all, the graces capable of effecting an immediate conversion of the world and of preparing and assuring reconciliation and peace.

Queen of Peace, pray for us and give the world at war the peace for which all peoples are longing, peace in the truth, in the justice, in the charity of Christ; pray for us that there may be a cessation of armed hostilities and that peace may return to men's souls, so that in the tranquillity of order the Kingdom of God may prevail.

American Education Must Right About Face

LOUIS J. A. MERCIER

ALL teachers' conventions are meeting this year in an unusually sober mood, and well they may.

Teachers are by profession idealists and optimists. They need to have enthusiasm to inspire their students. We have all tended to say for many years that we were fast progressing toward the millennium.

But this year, before the crumbling of western civilization, and at the thought of the thousands of our young men who must fall that it may rise from its ruins, even the most optimistic among us may be moved to ask themselves a few questions.

If the world has stumbled into unimaginable catastrophes, then in a broad sense the teachers of the world must have failed.

Why, and how have they failed? That is evidently the first question.

One great Harvard teacher with whom I was long associated, and who practically predicted some thirty years ago what is now happening to us, used to say, in the light of what was already beginning to happen in his time, that the teachers of the world had failed because they had gone wrong on first principles.

More recently, a national writer, whose analytical powers you, no doubt, all respect, expressed the same conclusion in the last chapter of his recent

Address delivered by the Associate Professor of French and Education, Harvard University, at the general meeting of the Hampden County Teachers Association Ninety-fourth Convention, Springfield, Mass., October 30, 1942.

book, *The Good Society*—I mean Mr. Walter Lippmann.

According to Irving Babbitt, the teachers of the world were failing, because since Rousseau they had come to say that man was naturally good, that he could be encouraged to follow all the urges of his appetites, while, as a matter of fact, his appetites are selfish and constantly tend to excess.

Nor can you rescue man from his natural selfishness, added Babbitt, by trying to give him the ideal of improving society. You can't improve society except through the moral improvement of the individual, for only self-disciplined individuals can improve society.

The philosophers of antiquity had discovered that truth. Confucius and Buddha had done so. Christianity preached the need of this conversion with the help of the grace of God, and if you do not believe in the grace of God, concluded Irving Babbitt, you must at least restudy the problem of righteousness which Plato and Aristotle and the Stoics, Confucius and Buddha recognized. It is because you

have not done so that you have gone wrong on first principles.

DIVINE AND NATURAL LAW

In his analysis of the failure of our educators, Irving Babbitt did not mention God, but Walter Lippmann has. He did so in the last chapter of *The Good Society*, and he called that chapter "Upon This Rock." That rock now for Walter Lippmann is faith in the existence of a personal God, of a reality and a righteousness outside ourselves and antecedent to ourselves.

It implies that our lives and civilization are not to be shaped according to our selfish desires, but according to Divine law and to natural law, thus respecting the rights of all men that flow from their God-given nature.

As Mr. Lippmann expressed it:

It was in the recognition that there is in each man a final essence, that is to say an immortal soul, which only God can judge, that a limit was set upon the domination of men over men . . . (it was) upon that rock (that) men built the foundation of the good society.

Insofar then as we no longer recognize this dual reality; the antecedent abiding reality of God's righteousness, as well as the changing reality of the world, and no longer teach that the changing reality of the world must be made to conform to the abiding reality of the Divine law, we have gone wrong on first principles.

The ultimate question then is: Have we really rejected widely as a philosophy of education this dualistic philosophy of God's righteousness and

of the necessity of teaching our students to discipline themselves to the eternal laws of the moral order as well as to those of the physical world?

In all candor, we must recognize that we have certainly very widely done so. Our foremost philosopher of education has told us that "the faith in the Divine Author and authority in which western civilization confided . . . and inherited ideas of the soul and its destiny, have been made impossible for the cultivated mind of the western world" and we have very widely believed him, as we have generally believed our materialistic psychologists who also told us that we had no souls.

This same foremost philosopher of education has further told us:

Christianity which proffered a fixed revelation of absolute unchanging being and truth elaborated into morals conceived as a code of laws, the same everywhere and at all times; our present economic regime conceived as something fixed except for experiments in detail; the institution of marriage and family that developed in medieval Europe considered as the last and unchanging word; were but examples of the extent to which ideas of fixity persist in a moving world.

He invited us to be ready to discard them all if our new experiences warranted it, and we have also widely acquiesced. At least, if we are to trust statistics and surveys, over 50 per cent of our educators throughout the country have done so, and among these, the most influential.

This new creed has never been better expressed than in a manifesto, signed not only by this same foremost philosopher of education but by others

of our prominent educators, which reads in part as follows:

The time has passed for Deism and Theism. The universe is self-existing and not created. Man is but a part of nature and has emerged as the result of a continuous process. The dualism of mind and body must be rejected. The highest ideal of man is the improvement of this life.

The signers of this manifesto called themselves religious humanists. Incidentally, they really have no right to do so. The humanists of the Renaissance in general still believed that man was distinct in nature, while the signers of the manifesto believe that he is but a superior animal. The term religion traditionally means the recognition of relations between man and a God distinct from him, and our signers do not believe in such a God. They should call themselves, and insofar as we follow them, we should call ourselves humanitarian naturalists. We are naturalists insofar as we believe that the only reality is nature in perpetual evolution, and we are humanitarians insofar as our highest ideal is the improvement of humanity considered as its own end.

The only trouble with that ideal is that without an antecedent God, there can be no humanity. A social group can only be constituted by a common end. There can be an orchestra or a choir only if men and women conceive as their common end the production of more or less harmonious sounds. There can be a nation only if within a certain area people can discover at least one common end. If they don't, they will remain warring minor

groups. But where can you find a common end big enough to constitute humanity, as a reality above all times and all places, save in a Being Who is above all times and places? That Being can only be an abiding God.

Disown the idea of an abiding God as the Creator and the ultimate end of all men, and you can only have peoples in various times and places, each working for its own ends in terms of their own time and place. Hence, place must forever war against place, and time against time. Progress for the monistic, naturalistic philosophy of total change can only come from repudiations of the past, in the light of new and conflicting exigencies in different places.

PERPETUAL WAR

What you inevitably must get from the atheistic philosophy of total change is not the improvement of humanity, which cannot exist on the premises of that philosophy. What you must inevitably get from that philosophy is perpetual war. And that's precisely what we got.

What we got is Hitlerism or rather Nazism, and Nazism is the wonderfully logical product of the philosophy we have been elaborating, and more and more living by, for the last hundred and fifty years. Insofar as we have not defended Christianity, or at least Deism, in England, France and the United States, insofar as we have become atheists, monists, immanentists, humanitarian naturalists, we have all

contributed to the production of Hitler.

For here we come to a most significant historical fact. The monistic immanentist philosophy from which the philosophy of our still most influential educational leaders sprang is of Germanic origin. It goes back to Hegel. The displacement, not only of Christianity, but of Deism by the pantheistic and hence atheistic philosophy of Hegel was the great intellectual revolution of the early 19th century. It reached us through our growing contacts with German thought and universities, it merged with and strengthened the naturalistic conception of evolution after Darwin, it was stripped of some of its elaborations by our American practical sense, it eventuated into our pragmatism and experimentalism, but the upshot of it all was that thus following our most determined educational philosophers, direct or remote disciples of Hegel, we came to believe that constant change was the only reality, that an impersonal absolute was realizing itself in institutions and nations. Abandoning the idea of a God above men, their Creator and end, we came to believe that we are in turn the highest expression of whatever good there is. We made what we considered our social good our only good, created by our own efforts, according to our own desires.

We have a remarkable proof of how completely we have become influenced by the philosophy of total change into believing that we are free to de-

vised new moral codes to suit ourselves, in the controversy about a proposed legislation before this Commonwealth. This is not the place to discuss that issue, but some of the arguments already used in that controversy are to the point.

According to our public press, advocates of that legislation accused its opponents of making their objections "on moral grounds rather than on significant social grounds."

Kindly note the opposition set up in that sentence: significant social grounds versus moral grounds, a presumed social expediency versus the moral law. That's exactly what Hitler says: "What I consider social expediency requires me to violate what you call moral principles."

MINORITY OR MAJORITY OPINION

Let us take another revealing sentence in the same controversy. The same advocate of favorable legislation on the issue, according to the same public press, accused the opponents of that legislation of raising the question "whether minority opinion on matters of morality shall be enforced by state regulation on the entire body politic."

This sentence evidently implies that morality is a matter of minority or majority opinion: then clearly we hold that we are masters of our own morality, that we have the right to establish our code of morality even against natural or Divine law.

Again, that's precisely what Hitler says: that man, in his case, those who

belong to the master race, are makers of morality, that morality is to be settled on the basis of a presumed social expediency.

Well, why not go on from there?

If in the name of social expediency we may deny birth to the possible child by violating nature's laws and not merely by practicing the self-control which every unmarried man and woman must exercise, why in the name of the same social expediency, may we not kill the old man or woman, the incapacitated, the incurable, or, for that matter, anyone who is an annoyance to us or to society? If we are the masters of life, why not kill burdensome prisoners, or starve or exterminate all alien peoples, or liquidate those who oppose the advent of the social order we believe in?

All these practices, to our horror, have reappeared in the western world, but let us note it well, they have reappeared because they all flow logically from the atheistic philosophy of total change, from the repudiation of an antecedent God and of the natural law, and from the consequent doctrine that we are free to devise our own morality according to what we have come to call our social frame of reference.

The question that obtrudes at this point, is, therefore: If the atheistic philosophy of total change has brought Europe to its downfall, and to unprecedented moral degradation, how can we hope to rescue Europe from that degradation, or even to save ourselves, if we ourselves are permeated by and

pay allegiance to the same philosophy?

The logical conclusion then, would seem to be: Insofar as American educators have capitulated to atheistic philosophies, then unless they want to betray their country and the world, they must right about face.

RIGHT ABOUT FACE

In other words, we should now be able clearly to understand that there are two and only two ultimate alternatives of thought, the ultimate alternative of the philosophy of total change which denies an antecedent God, and the contrary alternative which believes in God as the Creator of the universe.

There is no way of escaping the choice between these two alternatives. Not even agnosticism can do so practically. If we choose the first, we may, it is true, remain free to devise our own morality according to what we shall consider social expediency, but we now see to our dismay what the following of that alternative has led to: the lowest moral or rather immoral standards in the history of the west through the free development of animal appetites and of conflicting selfish wills to power. We deified ourselves and finally one race deified itself against the rest of us.

Why then should we not re-examine the possibilities of the other ultimate alternative of thought: the existence of a personal God, Creator of the universe? It is true that if we believe in God the Creator we are bound

to try to discover, and we are bound to obey the laws of His creation. But we might at once recall with Mr. Lippmann that his faith in a personal God reinforced by Christianity was the foundation of western civilization, and that, whatever the failure of men to utilize it fully may have been, it nevertheless raised the west from the uncertain morality of the Roman Empire and from the chaos of the barbarian invasions, and gave us the concepts of the dignity of every man and woman and of inalienable rights; while it took but some one hundred and fifty years for the contrary philosophy to bring us back to barbarism through moral anarchy.

To pronounce those words "inalienable rights" should remind us that faith in God the Creator was the foundation stone of our American democracy. The signers of the Declaration of Independence appealed to the Supreme Judge of the world for the rectitude of their intentions, and they inscribed in the same document that all men are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights.

INALIENABLE RIGHTS

The speeches of our Presidents, from Washington to Roosevelt, have continued to give us the doctrine that has made our strength as a nation and has safeguarded our liberties, the doctrine that God the Creator endowed man with intelligence and will, that He is our ultimate end, that hence we have duties toward ourselves, toward our

neighbor and toward Him as self-responsible persons, and that, as a consequence of these duties, we have inalienable rights against anyone or even against a majority, that we have inalienable rights against the State, to worship God and to obey the laws of His creation, the natural and the Divine law. Therefore all peoples are entitled to a bill of rights, religion must be exempted from civil jurisdiction, we must learn to govern ourselves not according to our own selfish desires but according to the laws of God, and hence, we have no right to pass laws against the eternal foundations of righteousness.

We may not vote against God. Render unto Caesar what belongeth to Caesar, and to God what belongeth to God. This, the makers of our nation believed, is the only possible foundation of liberty and fraternity, of social progress and of international peace.

The doctrine still permeates the lives of our people even if it is receding from our thought as educators. We still say: "So help me God," every time we take an oath, we still invoke God in our legislative halls, we still sing in the Star-Spangled Banner: "in God is our trust." Only three years ago, our President again summed up the whole issue when he said in a message to Congress that "the defense of democracy, of international good faith and of religion is all the same fight, and that to save one, we must make up our mind to save all."

We are thus confronted by the curious situation already alluded to that, insofar as our leading educators are committed to an atheistic philosophy of total change, and keep on telling us, as they must on their premises, that the American people's faith in a personal God, and in abiding righteousness in a fixed natural and divine law, are outmoded ways of thought, they are working directly to undermine the foundations of our American philosophy of life and government.

This I am, as much as you no doubt are, loath to recognize, but there seems to be no help for it, except to give up logical thinking.

In the atheistic conception of a self-existing universe in total evolution, in which man is conceived as but a part of the total becoming, the individual can only exist in terms of his social group, and hence, he can only be a mere tool of the State with no possible appeal against its decisions in the name of personal inalienable rights, since, according to the philosophy of total change, there is no abiding righteousness, there is no God above men and nations to Whom we may appeal.

If there is no personal God, there can be no human person. If you merge God in nature, you must also merge man in nature. If a personal God is not the master, then impersonal men will be the slaves of the most ruthless. If there is no God's right, then some men's might will be the law.

On this issue, let me refer you to

Walter Lippmann who expresses all this in more forcible terms, than in my academic timidity I would dare to use.

As Mr. Lippmann puts it:

In the fury to explain men rationally, there was explained away all their essence which was their manhood. There remained only an organism which was born, was nourished, was stimulated, reproduced itself, was destined to fight, was consumed and then died; there was only this passive being, determined by inheritance and circumstance and, therefore, fit only to be manipulated and used. To the heresiarchs of the 19th century, the Hegelians, the Marxians, the pseudo-Darwinians, the destiny of this creature was manifest. Did they not have their histories to prove that men were less than men, emanations of the Absolute, pawns moved by the dialectic of history, animals struggling for survival, cells in a super-organism . . . Having conceived man as a being without autonomy, they could not believe he had authentic purposes, inalienable rights, or binding obligations: insofar as he seemed to be purposeful, to claim rights, to perform duties, they had to explain his behavior as the rationalization of his appetites and his circumstances . . . With man (thus) degraded to a bundle of conditioned reflexes, there was left no measure of anything in human affairs: all the landmarks of judgment were gone, and there remained only an aimless and turbulent moral relativity.

Whereupon Mr. Lippmann concludes, "this denial of the human soul was the perfect preparation for the revivals of tyranny."

LOGICAL CONSEQUENCES

In this vehement repudiation of our materialistic psychologists and of our atheistic philosophers of education, Mr. Lippmann not only recalls, you will note, the whole development of the monistic alternative of thought from Hegelianism and pseudo-Darwinism, but he sketches powerfully

how enslaving are the implications of that alternative. For that is the peculiarity of the ultimate alternatives of thought. They have logical consequences. They lock us up within their range of thought, and the range of thought of the atheistic alternative is the most narrow.

In its materialistic form, it forces you to try to explain all psychological processes by brain modifications, all history by physical and economic pressures. It turns you away from even entertaining the possibility of spiritual realities, and it obliges you to dismiss *a priori* the historical data and the logical reasoning which may support them.

Hegelian pantheism and its offshoots would seem to be less restrictive. But by substituting the notion of becoming to the notion of being, they lead you to look upon all elements of past cultures as obsolete, and to think of studying only the experiences of the present that you may understand the wave of the future.

Hence, from this double aspect of the monistic or naturalistic outlook, the narrowly utilitarian trend in our education of the last forty years. It disparaged the doctrine of transfer of training or of a general education, for how could there be a general development of intelligence when there was no mind but just a collection of material reflexes, or why should we study principles and standards when the new experience alone was said to count, and even that was changing? Hence, the

constant pressure against the studies that had been held to have a disciplinary value and against the humanities, ancient and modern.

And yet, it should be obvious that this cutting us off from all the great cultural and religious traditions can only eventuate in a suffocatingly narrow provincialism and a total incapacity for critical thought, since critical thought about our own time and place can only be developed through acquaintance with other times and places and modes of thought. If you are a green pea in a green pod, and you never get out of your pod, you'll think that all reality is green and you won't even know what green is, since you'll have nothing to compare it with.

NEED INTELLIGENT CRITICISM

It should be clear that the slogan that education should be in terms of the pupil's environment is an enslaving doctrine. That's the slogan Hitler uses. On the contrary, education, no matter what else it must do to prepare youth to earn a living or to serve the nation, should free the pupil from his environment, lift him out of it, till he can judge it in the light of the experience of the race presented to him objectively, including the tradition of the natural and the Divine law above all times and places which only the study of religion can give. Today we need technicians, but we need, no less, citizens capable of intelligent criticism.

Mr. Lippmann is right. The denial of the human soul was the perfect

preparation for the revivals of tyranny, because it was the denial of what the human soul implies: man as an autonomous person with inalienable rights including the right to be given a chance to know at first hand all the alternatives of thought and to choose between them.

Insofar, then, as American education has become dominated by the atheistic alternative of thought, it should right about face.

American students have certainly the right to be initiated fully to their own tradition. It is certainly our duty to teach in American schools the American Bill of Rights. If so, it is also our duty to bring out that our Bill of Rights cannot intelligently be defended, and that the founding fathers of our nation never pretended that it could be defended without the assertion of the existence of God. That's merely part of the record.

What else can we do? That is evidently the greatest educational problem before us. In the classroom of a public institution, it would seem, no one has a right to take a stand theistic or atheistic, Protestant, Jewish or Catholic. A truly neutral school or college should present all doctrines objectively to its students, but it has no right to tell them to believe any, or even that it believes any.

If then logic and what has happened to the western world point out that the inalienable rights of man and our American ways of life cannot survive except through that faith in God

the Creator which was at their source, then evidently the neutral school is practically incapable by itself of safeguarding our American institutions since it cannot teach religion.

NECESSARY PRECAUTIONS

But at least, the school and even more, the college needs to see to it that the dice is not loaded against their students, and to do so they must take the necessary precautions against the subtle atheistic and naturalistic indoctrination of their students by the textbooks used by the teacher.

At once it may be objected that this would be an interference with the freedom of the teacher. The answer evidently is that, in public institutions, the teacher has no right and should have no freedom to indoctrinate in philosophy or religion, and that, on the other hand, the student has rights against such indoctrination and that these rights should be jealously safeguarded.

In other words, the teacher has a right to his ultimate alternative of thought, theism or atheism, but he has no right in a public institution to use a course in science, education, literature, sociology or history to preach theism or atheism, or any philosophical or religious doctrine.

If a teacher uses a course in science to tell our children that they have uncultivated minds if they believe in God, or a course in education to tell them that all their mental processes are like those of rats because they are

wholly material, then, we have as parents the right to protest, and our children have the right to tell the teacher, in their own amiable jargon, that they think that he or she is "all wet" and still get an A for the course.

In any case it should be clear that the rights of the students can be safeguarded only by labeling courses properly. A course in atheism should not be labeled a course in evolution, or a course against Christianity a Renaissance course, or a course in Communism a course in economics.

Furthermore, the safeguarding of the rights of the students demands that before the teacher puts a controversial book in their hands, he or she should tell them to what school of thought the author belongs, and that books representative of all doctrines should be available. This means also that in the high school and in the introductory courses in college, where the work must be skimpy and rapid, only textbooks should be used which are written in such a way that all schools of thought can be satisfied with their objectivity, and that, if this is impossible, textbooks on the survey in question written from the different points of view should be available.

All these precautions, however, can only safeguard our students from being indoctrinated with atheism and naturalism. But if we have the right to ask that in our public institutions our children shall not be indoctrinated in irreligion, the atheist and the naturalist have the right to ask that in

the same public institutions, their children shall not be indoctrinated in traditional religion or in a theistic philosophy.

FAITH THE FOUNDATION

Well, if faith in God is necessary as the only possible basis for the inalienable rights of man, if that faith is the foundation of our institutions and of our way of life, if the resolutions that you passed last year in your convention that "the development of man can be recognized as the major purpose of civilization" cannot be implemented without the recognition of a personal God, if President Roosevelt was right in saying that the maintenance of our democracy and of religion is all the same fight, and if, on the other hand, the neutral public school and college cannot teach religion, then again, evidently American education must be readjusted. Not only must it insist more rigidly that the teaching of irreligion be kept out of the classroom, but it must look to the Church for help in safeguarding our nation.

What a challenge that call may mean to the Churches and to us in working out a cooperation, according to the wishes of the parents of our children, between school and church is evidently not a question that can be taken up at the end of an address.

That these issues have long been visioned in some quarters is evidenced by the sacrifices of those who have all along insisted on their rights to sup-

port religious schools, thus affording a great relief to us all as tax-payers.

The religious school, unhindered by the State, is the hallmark of a nation's freedom. All totalitarian regimes begin by interfering with the religious schools, and we may be sure that, if we were ever tempted to do this ourselves, the death knell of our own freedom would have sounded.

But the history of education reveals that private enterprise in no country has ever been strong enough to insure an adequate general development of school systems for the whole nation. State systems of education would then seem to be essential. The problem then is that the public school systems are not set up as opponents of the churches, as they have been in various countries, but that on the contrary, a way be found to make Church and School complement each other, which means that, far from weaning our children from religion, the school and the college will encourage them to seek philosophical and religious teaching outside of their own walls.

NEED OF RELIGION

That our citizens have already begun to understand this need is clear from the fact that in New York, in our own state, and, no doubt, in others, provision has already been made not only to encourage but to facilitate such cooperation between the school, the home, and the Church in line with our American tradition of the need of religion voiced by our presidents

from Washington, through Lincoln to Roosevelt.

It may perhaps, therefore, not be too much to ask that we now give more generally our best thought to this needed readjustment of our education.

In closing let me apologize for my earnestness in trying to clear up that issue, and let me assure you that in discussing doctrines, there was no thought of passing judgments on their proponents.

But we stand today poised at one of the most agonizing moments of our country's and of the world's history. On one side is Europe enslaved by men holding doctrines the origin of which, all must admit, spring from the negation of the God of our fathers. On the other is Japan throttling the Orient, and finding its strength in a no less pagan totalitarianism. Between these two tortured continents stand the Americas, alone with England willing to claim that they are fighting for the faith that made the western world.

In a few months a million of our young men may die that the social and political charter of human freedom which sprang from that faith may not perish.

In such a moment, there seems to be no way of escaping the thought that it is our duty to reexamine what may have become contradictory in our own doctrines, that we may be the better prepared to offer the world a sound leadership on the morrow of our victory.

Dutch Bishops' Pastoral

Text of the Joint Pastoral Letter, dated February 17, 1943, issued by the Dutch Hierarchy forbidding priests and Catholic people of the Netherlands to cooperate with Nazi oppression. N.C.W.C.

BELOVED FAITHFUL:
The bitter suffering and anguished worry under whose weight so many are stooped, in consequence of the severe measures taken, especially in these recent times, by the Occupation authorities, urge us to write to you and to convey our sense of common participation.

We are filled with the deepest compassion for the numberless persons called upon to bear such great and bitter sufferings. But we would fail in our duty if we did not publicly raise our voice against the injustice to which so large a part of our people is being subjected. In this we are following that path indicated to us by our Holy Father, the Pope, who in his latest Christmas Message, among other things, declared:

The Church would be untrue to herself, ceasing to be a mother, if she turned a deaf ear to children's anguished cries, which reach her from every class of the human family. She does not intend to take sides for either of the particular forms in which the several peoples and States strive to solve the gigantic problems of domestic order or international collaboration, as long as these forms conform to the Law of God. But, on the other hand, as the "Pillar and Ground of Truth" and guardian, by the will of God and the mandate of Christ, of the natural and supernatural order, the Church cannot renounce her right to proclaim to her sons and to the whole world the unchanging basic laws, saving them from every perversion, obfuscation, corruption, false interpretation and error.

Therefore, with other important church groups, we have directed to the Reichs Commissioner the following letter:

"The Protestant churches and the Roman Catholic Church in Holland feel compelled to write once more to you, Herr Reichs Commissioner, with profound seriousness. On many occasions already they have directed to you grave complaints against the mounting injustice with which the Dutch people are being treated, which is a matter that also affects profoundly the churches themselves.

"As they told you, they, by the calling imposed upon them in the Name of Christ, have made their voice heard also when principles rooted in the Gospel were impugned in public life. They pointed out particularly those principles which constitute the foundations of the public Christian life of our people; namely, Justice, Mercy and Liberty in their relation to human life.

"They must bear witness to the fact that the heads of Governments, too, are subject to the law of God, and have the obligation of abstaining from acts that are prohibited by that law. The churches would fail in their responsibility if they neglected to admonish the heads of Governments for the sins committed by them in the exercise

of their power, or neglected to forewarn them by reminding them of the severity of the judgment of God.

"The churches already have denounced the increasing lack of justice; the persecution and execution of Jewish fellow-citizens; the imposition of a conception of life and of the world that is contradictory to the Gospel of Jesus Christ; forced labor service as an institution of National Socialist education; the violation of the freedom of Christian instruction; the imposition of forced labor in Germany on Dutch workers; the execution of hostages; the arrest and imprisonment of many persons, among them ecclesiastical dignitaries, under such conditions that a very considerable number already have had to make the sacrifice of their lives in concentration camps.

VIOLATION OF DIVINE LAW

"Now, to all this is added the hunting down, as if they were slaves, the arrest and deportation of thousands of young people.

"In all these actions the Divine Law has been violated in increasing measure.

"The churches preach against hate and the spirit of vengeance in the heart of our people, and raise their voice against manifestations of these vices. According to the Word of God, no one can be his own judge. But in the same measure, the churches also have the duty, by their calling, to preach this word of God: 'Obey God rather than men.' This function serves as the norm

in all conflicts of conscience, even for those arising from the measures in question. By virtue of Divine Law, no one may offer the slightest collaboration to acts of injustice, because, in so doing, he shares the guilt of the injustice itself.

"Herr Reichs Commissioner, it is in obedience to the Lord that the churches are obliged to address this letter to you: they pray that God may lead you in His way, that you may restore the right so grievously violated in the exercise of your power."

Thus far our collective letter to the Reichs Commissioner.

Beloved Faithful, in the midst of all the injustice and anguish you have suffered our sympathy goes out in a very special manner to the young forcibly taken from their homes, to the Jews and to our brethren of the Catholic Faith who are of Jewish descent, who are exposed to so great suffering. Furthermore, we are profoundly grieved by the fact that, for the execution of the measures taken against these two categories of persons, the collaboration of our own fellow-citizens, such as those in public authority, State employes and the directors of institutions, has been demanded.

Beloved Brethren, we are aware in how serious a conflict the consciences of the persons involved find themselves. Therefore, to remove any doubt and uncertainty you may entertain on this point, we declare most emphatically that collaboration in this matter is forbidden in conscience.

If refusal to collaborate should demand sacrifices of you, be strong and constant in the conviction that you are doing your duty before God and man.

Beloved Brethren, we have not physical force at our disposal. All the more, therefore, we exhort you to adopt that means which, everything considered, is infallible, that is, suppliant

prayer that God may hasten to take pity on us and upon the world.

This our Joint Pastoral is to be read in the usual manner at all scheduled Masses on Septuagesima Sunday, February 21, in all churches and all chapels having a permanent rector and within our ecclesiastical province.

Given at Utrecht, February 17, 1943.



College of Cardinals

Since the death of Cardinal Baudrillart, the Sacred College consists only of 48 Cardinals, thus being far from complete. France is now represented only by two Cardinals, as are Spain and the United States. Ireland, England, Canada, Portugal, Hungary, Brazil, Argentina, Belgium, Poland and the Syrian Catholics have one Cardinal each. The eldest Cardinal is the Dean of the Sacred College (Cardinal Granito del Belmonte, 90 years of age). The youngest Cardinal is the Archbishop of Gran, Hungary, born in 1884. Pius XI created 48 Cardinals, of whom 42 are still alive. One of the last Cardinals to be proclaimed by Pius XI was Cardinal Gerlier, Archbishop of Lyons. Pope Pius XII has not yet proclaimed any new Cardinals.



Variety in the Church

The Church hates all kinds of totalitarianism and rigid uniformism, but more than any other She hates liturgical cast-iron uniforms: Milan, Lyons, Toledo, Bragá, the Cistercians, Carthusians and Dominicans are our witnesses. The more we are made conscious of the fact that variety is richness, the better for this age of drab conventionalism.—*H. A. R. in ORATE FRATRES, February, 1943.*

SOME THINGS OLD AND NEW

CARDINAL GRAND PENITENTIARY

Who or what is the Cardinal Grand Penitentiary, and what are the duties of his office?

Among the oldest and most important offices of the Roman Curia is that of the Grand Penitentiary, now always filled by a Cardinal. It dates from probably the early part of the third century, and is mainly concerned with those matters that deal with the conscience of the Faithful. Looked at in its proper historical perspective, it is one of the soundest proofs of the Primacy of the Roman Pontiff.

The head of the tribunal is the Cardinal Grand Penitentiary, who in addition to presiding over the Sacred Penitentiary, also has jurisdiction over the confessors of the Roman Patriarchal Basilicas and the Papal Basilicas of Italy.

The tribunal over which the Cardinal Grand Penitentiary presides grants absolutions, dispensations and deals with cases in which an individual has incurred a censure or is in a condition where the personal authority of the Pope himself is required for remission or absolution. So, in a sense, the Sacred Penitentiary is the confessional of the Pope, because through it persons who can be absolved only by the Pope himself receive

absolution ultimately from the Holy Father.

During Holy Week it is the custom for the Grand Penitentiary to proceed to the three great Basilicas in Rome: St. Peter's, the Lateran and St. Mary Major, and there seated on the Penitentiary's throne be ready to hear the confessions of those who wish to approach the Sacrament of Penance. The occasion is very public, and it is seldom that any penitent makes use of the opportunity. But many approach the Grand Penitentiary to be touched by the ceremonial rod, to which act of penitence 300 days indulgence is attached.

In cases of conscience submitted to the Sacred Penitentiary the name of the penitent is concealed, and after the case has been decided and the reply given, the documents in the case are destroyed. Hence the name sometimes used of the Tribunal of the Un-named.

PROTESTANTS IN SPAIN

If, as you have said, the Catholic Church favors religious liberty, why is it that Protestants are persecuted in Spain?

It is news to us that Protestants are persecuted in Spain. There is this much of truth, that about the time of

the Reformation, when Protestants were—well, not very tactful or tolerant in their habits—they did not receive a great deal of toleration in Spain. But that was a long time ago, and even later, as Borrow in his anti-Catholic book *Bible in Spain* says, Protestant Bible merchants were more concerned with propagandist zeal than with consideration for the religious principles of the Spanish people.

But the fact is that both under the monarchy and under the Franco Government, Protestants in Spain have been allowed a large measure of religious freedom.

Spain, it should be remembered, is a Catholic country, and the Catholic Religion is the religion of Spain. So why should Protestant propagandists have free rein to disturb the religious convictions of the mass of the Spanish people? So the Catholic Religion was and is the religion which takes first place in the religious public life of the nation.

There were, and probably still are, certain restrictions regarding Protestant places of worship in Spain. These Protestant churches were not allowed to ring church bells, nor were they permitted to make their places of worship public in the same way that the Catholic churches were allowed to appear publicly as places of worship.

But Protestants, as such, were allowed perfect freedom of worship within their conventicles. And if their pastors were not subsidized by the Government, that was and is no more

than fair, since only a small minority of the Spanish people are Protestants and, moreover, the property of the Catholic Church had been nationalized. The sectaries are not persecuted; they are simply asked to keep within their own confines and not to upset the religious convictions of the majority of the Spanish people.

PAWNBROKERS VS. USURERS

Usury is condemned by the Catholic Church. Why, then, is not the system of pawnbroking also condemned by the Church?

When usury was condemned by the Church, it was before the present capitalist system came into being, and it was directed against a certain clan (polite, that!) of people in Europe who had secured a monopoly in the lending of money.

But, as a matter of fact and of history, the first pawnbrokers started in business under the auspices and with the blessing of the Church. These organizations—if you can call them by that title—were pawnshops whose sole object was the making of small loans, at a low rate of interest, and for which certain moveable properties were pledged, to be redeemed when the loan was repaid. Thus this was a work of charity, and the idea of any sort of usurious profit was entirely excluded. The name of these early pawnshops was *Mons pietatis*—the heap of money.

The Franciscans in Italy first established these charitable works. The

Mons at Perugia, which was established in January 1463, began with a small capital. Poor and needy persons were aided by loans according to their requirements. But before the loans were granted, officials of the organization investigated their need and received pledges as security. The small amount of interest charged was just sufficient to pay the expenses of conducting the institution.

As to the Church's attitude towards these early pawnbroking systems, they were approved as a work of charity by the Fifth Lateran Council, and later they spread throughout the countries of Europe.

Now that is what the Church had to say about the first pawnbrokers. But the fraternity today is something different, and has little, if anything, to do with the Church's teaching regarding interest on loans. But pawnbroking, as such, is not contrary to the moral teaching of the Church. It is the squeezing out of exorbitant interest on loans which is against the moral teaching of our Church.

GESTAPO "CATHOLIC" SPIES

Is there any truth in the statement that the Gestapo trains spies, whose work is to bore within among foreign Catholics?

The statement may be true, or it may not be. We give the following information as we have received it:

Between Schwerin and Rostock, in Mecklenburg, there is an old mansion, situated in beautiful surroundings, but

the present occupiers are feared and hated by the peasants of the surrounding countryside.

No one has access to it except with a special permit, which can be obtained only from the highest Gestapo authorities in Berlin. The Gestapo now owns this house, and has established a strange school there.

Pupils come from all parts of the Reich for a long course of instruction in disintegration or special propaganda work in almost every language in the world. A picked detachment of the Death's Head Brigade is charged with the supervision and control of trainees, who are recruited from the most talented and reliable members of the Nazi Party.

For some time this school has included a special Catholic department, which accepts only pupils who possess a sound knowledge of doctrinal theology, the mentality of the Catholic institutions and all religious usages.

After completing the course, these students go to some Catholic district of Germany, where they merge with the population, and live for a time as ordinary citizens and "good Catholics." The purpose of this period is to bring the future agents into contact with prominent Catholics, whose confidence they are encouraged to win. When this has been accomplished, they must procure from these Catholics introductions to distinguished Catholic dignitaries, which will be useful to them in their future work. After some time these agents are recalled by the Gestapo, and

they then are sent abroad to begin their operations.

Many of these agents have been sent to non-belligerent countries. Some to Spain, Portugal, Eire and particularly to the republics of South America.

RUSSIA AND PIUS XII

I understand that the Holy Father made a special prayer in behalf of Russia. Can you give the text of that prayer?

When Pope Pius XII in his radio broadcast in 1942 consecrated the Church and the world to the Immaculate Heart of Mary, His Holiness made an allusion to religious conditions in Russia, although not directly by name, in which he hoped for future religious improvement in that country.

The passage in the Pope's prayer which is regarded as having a special allusion to Russia is as follows:

"Give peace to the peoples separated by error and discord, and especially to those who profess such singular devotion to Thee, that no home was ever without Thy venerated ikon, today often hidden and reserved for better days. Give them peace, and bring them back to the One Fold of Christ under the one and true Shepherd."

This part of the Pope's prayer was contained towards its conclusion, and was not given out to the press immediately following the broadcast. But it is generally understood that the Holy Father in these words was offering a special prayer for the Christian people of Russia.



Living Church

It is true, indeed, that the deposit of Faith has not altered since the last of the Apostles died, nor can it be altered. But the doctrine of the Church does not stand still with the unrolling of the centuries. The doctrine of the Church is in a state of ever deepening understanding of that deposit. Under the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, it is developing even now, and will continue to develop. For the Church is not Christ dead, but Christ alive, living on through the centuries, and indeed not only Christ, the Life-giver, but Christ, the Teacher.—*The Rev. N. H. Gascoigne in the NEW ZEALAND TABLET, February 3, 1943.*